OF THE DISTINCTION OF FVNDAMENTAL AND NOT FVNDAMENTAL POINTS OF FAITH.

DEVIDED INTO TVVO BOOKES.

In the first is shewed the Protestants opinion touching that distinction, and their vncertaintie therin.

In the second is shewed and proued the Catholik doctrin touching the same.

By C. R. Doctor of Diuinitie.

Ephes. 4.

One God, one Faith, one Baptisme.

AN. M. DC. XLV.

IN this Treatiſe is refuted the gene-ral doctrin of Proteſtants, concer-ning the diſtinction of Fundamental and Not fundamental points of faith in their ſenſe: but particularly, the doctrin of the Late English Proteſtant Writers touching the ſame, namely. W. Laude, Lord of Canterburie, in his *Relation of Conference, &c.* D. Potter, in his *Anſwer to charitie miſtaken*, wherof I cite the firſt edition, for want of the ſecond: and of Mr Chillingworth, in his *Anſwer to Mercie and Truth.* wherby is refuted the moſt material parte of their ſaid Books.

This Treatiſe was made ſome yeares agoe, but not printed, in hope that thes tumults in England wold haue bene ended before this time: but ſeing no end of them, is now published.

THE PREFACE to the Reader.

VVHERIN ARE SET dovvne the contents of this Treatiſe. 1.

1. PRoteſtants do teach, that only the principal or capital points of Chriſtian faith, are of the ſubſtance of ſauing faith, true Church, and waie of ſaluation, and alone, truly and indeed, neceſſarie to them: and that al other points of faith are, at moſt, of the perfectiō of ſauing faith, true Church, and waie of ſaluation, and maie be not beleued, though they bee ſufficiently propoſed, without los of the ſubſtance of ſauing faith, true Church, or ſaluation. And in this ſenſe they

See infra c. 2. n. 3 c. 12 n. 2.

Proteſtants make onely fundamētal points neceſſarie.

call the principal points, *Fundamental*, that is, alone ſubſtantial and truly neceſſarie to ſauing faith, to true Church, and to ſaluation : and call al other points, *Not Fundamental*, that is, nether ſubſtantial, nor truly neceſſarie to ſauing faith, true Church, or ſaluation, howſoeuer they be propoſed. And hereupon they teach, that al, who beleue the principal points of faith, howſoeuer they ſinfully beleue not other points, though they be ſufficienty propoſed to them, haue ſauing faith, are in the true Church, and in waie of ſaluation : and that who be deuided in ſecondarie points though ſufficiently propoſed, are not deuided in the ſubſtance of ſauing faith, of the true Church, or of the waie of ſalvation.

Their ground therof.

2. And the cheif ground (though they pretend Scripture) of this doctrin, that alone the principal points of faith are of the ſubſtance, and truly neceſſarie to ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation, is, that the principal points are termed *Fundamental*, or

the foundation, by Fathers and Catholiks: as if the wals and roof were not of the ſubſtance or neceſſarie to a howſe, becaus they are not fundamental, or the foundation of it. But the end, for which they teach this doctrin, is, to mainteine by it, that ſuch perſons or Churches, as they cannot denie, but ſinfully err in ſome points of faith, ether ſufficiently propoſed to them, or which would be ſo propoſed, if it were not their avoidable fault, haue neuertheles a ſauing faith, are true Churches, and in waie of ſaluation, nor deuided from them in the ſubſtance of faith, of true Church, or way of ſaluation. So that mere neceſſitie of mainteining Churches ſinfully erring in ſome points of faith, drew them to this ſinful and pernitious doctrin, that the principal points of faith are wholy ſufficient, and al other points, howſoeuer propoſed, wholy vnneceſſarie to the ſubſtance of ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation. And this is in truth their doctrin concerning fun-

Their end.

dam ental and not fundam ental points of faith, and their ground, and end of it. wherof the ground is sillie, the end sinful, and the doctrin pernitious and Antichristian, as quite ouerthrowing al Christian faith, as hereafter shal clearely appeare, and so abhominable, as the verie authors of it, are ashamed to exprès it in plaine termes, yea sometimes forced to denie it in words.

3. For albeit they teach expresly and absolutely. and without al exception or limitation of sufficient or not sufficient Proposal of not fundamentals, that *fundamentals*, are sufficient, and abundantly sufficient, and *Not fundamentals*, are vnnecessarie to saluing faith, true Church, and saluation: yet they are ashamed to saie so expresly with this addition, *euen then when not fundamentals are sufficiently proposed*, or, *when it is the Vnbeleuers faults, that they are not so proposed*, or, *when one sinfully erreth, in not fundamentals*. Yea sometimes they denie, they teach so, and affirme the con-

They are ashamed expresly to a touch their doctrin.

trarie. Yet that in effect and in deed they teach ſo, and meane ſo, we wil proue out of their common Tenets and Principles, and their plaine words and deeds. Nether in truth would this diſtinction of *fundamental* and *not fundamental* points afford them anie colour of mainteining ſuch erring Churches, as they endeauour to mainteine by it, vnles they meant, that *fundamentals*, are ſufficient, and *not fundamentals*, vnneceſſarie, to ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation, euen when *not fundamentals* are ſufficiently propoſed; or, it is the Vnbeleuers fault, that they are not ſo propoſed, becaus it is euident, that ſuch Churches err in ſome points of faith, which, ether are ſufficiently propoſed to them, or would be, if it were not their fault, and ſo doe ſinfully err in ſuch points. Nether alſo, would there otherwiſe be anie controuerſie about the ſufficiencie of *fundamentals*, and vnneceſſarines of *Not fundamentals*, to ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation, betwixt Ca-

Yet are forced to it.

1.

2.

tholiks and Proteſtants: becaus Catholiks grant, that *fundamental* points are fufficient, and *not fundamentals*, vnneceſſarie (to be actually beleued) to ſauing faith, to a true Church, and to ſaluation, when *not fundamentals* nether are ſufficiently propoſed, nor it is the Vnbeleuers fault, that they are not ſo propoſed. Nether finally,
3. would ſuch Churches, as they ſeek to mainteine by this diſtinction, giue them anie thanks, if they would afford ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation, only to ſuch of them, as inuincibly err in ſome not fundamental points not ſufficiently propoſed to them, or which not for their fault are not ſo propoſed: and would denie ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation, to al, that err ſinfully in anie point of faith: Wherfore as long, as by this diſtinction, they ſeek to mainteine erring Churches, or communicate with ſuch Churches, without excepting thos, who ſinfully err in not fundamental points, and alſo hold ſuch common Tenets and Principles

as they hold, in vaine they denie, that they teach that fundamental points are ſufficient, and not fundamentals not neceſſarie, to ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation, euen when not fundamentals are ſufficiently propoſed, or would be, if it were not the vnbeleuers fault.

Proteſtants cal their doctrin of defending ſinfully errants in faith charitie.

4. And this their doctrin, that ſuch, as beleue the fundamẽtal points, but ſinfully err in not fundamental points, or (which is al one) who err in not fundamental points ſufficiently propoſed to them, or which for their fault, are not ſo propoſed to them, haue ſauing faith, are in the true Church, and waie of ſaluation, they cal *Charitie*: and becaus we afford nether ſauing faith, true Church, nor ſaluation to anie ſuch, ſaie, they haue more charitie then we haue. But this their charitie towards ſinful errants in ſome points of faith, is not ſolid and grounded in anie word of God, which auoucheth ſuch ſinful errants to haue ſauing faith, to be in the true Church, and in waie of ſaluation, as ſo main a

But it is fals charitie, and ungrounded

point ought to be: but is only apparent charitie, grounded in humane pittie or compaſſion, if not in flatterie of ſuch errants, and is directly oppoſit to the word of God (as shal hereafter appeare) and to true charitie, as damnably deceauing them, by telling them that they haue ſauing faith, who deſtroie al ſauing faith; that they are in the true Church, who deſtroie the forme and vnitie of the true Church; and that they are in ſtate of ſaluation, who damnably ſin againſt faith; who excuſe al hereſies in not fundamental points, from damnable ſin; who bring in libertiniſme to beleue or not beleue not fundamental points; who allow communion in Sacraments with al heretiks in not fundamētal points; who denie Gods veracitie, and (as Proteſtants themſelues ſometimes confes) commit Infidelitie, and giue God the Lie. Such charitie it is (as God willing I shal clearely shew) to afford ſauing faith, true Church, and ſauation, to thos, who ſinfully err in not fundamental points: or (which

The manifold impieties of this doctrin.

See c. 10, n. 5. 6.

is al one) who err in not fundamental points of faith ſufficiently propoſed, or when it is their fault, that they are not ſo propoſed. Wherfore this fals charitable doctrin, is to be deteſted and impugned, not as a ſimple hereſie or error in faith, but as a ground of hereſies, ſciſme, infidelitie, and atheiſme. And it is in itſelfe ſo horrible to Chriſtian eares, as the verie defenders of it (though in verie deed and effect they do defend and muſt defend it, as long as they wil defend ſuch erring Churches, as they do, and communicate with them, and hold other their common Tenets and principles) yet are ashamed to auouch it in expres words, yea in words ſometimes diſclaime from it.

And a ground of Hereſie, Infidelitie, and Atheiſme.

5. wherfore in this Treatiſe, firſt of al, I ſet down plainely the true difference betwixt Catholiks and Proteſtants, toutching this diſtinction of Fundamental and not fundamental points of faith, in what ſenſe it is good, and admitted by Catholiks: in what, it is naught, and meant by

VVhat is handled in this Treatiſe.

Proteſtants. Next, I prove by Proteſſtants cleare words and deeds, and by diuers their common Tenets and Principles, that they hold, that vincible and ſinful error in not fundamental points, or error in them ſufficiently propoſed, maie ſtand with ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation. After I shew, why Proteſtants make diſtinction of points of faith rather by thes metaphorical and obſcure termes, *Fundamental, not fundamental*, then by proper and cleare termes, *Neceſſarie, not neceſſarie*. Then, that Proteſtants are not certaine, what a *not Fundamental* point is, nor vhich be *fundamental* points, which not: nor whether a true Church can err in fundamental points, or no, but now ſaie one thing, now the contrarie, as it maketh to their preſent purpos. Which evidently sheweth, that this their doctrin of the ſufficiencie of Fundamentals, and vnneceſſarienes of not fundamentals, is but a shift for the preſent, and not firmely beleved even of them who teach it: and ne-

uertheles do build vpon it, their defenſe of perſons and Churches, ſinfully erring in ſome points of faith, and of their own communion with ſuch, in Sacraments and publik worship of God. Which is to build their own and other mens ſalvation vpon a ground, not only moſt fals, and which they are ashamed to avoutch in plaine termes, but alſo which themſelues dot not firmely beleue.

6. And having shewed in the firſt booke this vncertaintie of Proteſtants, touching their Fundamental and not fundamental points, in the ſecond, I proceed to certaineties. And firſt of al, becaus Proteſtants ſometimes ſaie, that *not Fundamental* points ar not points of faith, I prove, that there are manie points of faith, beſide the Principal or Capital points, which are thos that are called *Fundamental*. Next I prove, that ſinfully to denie anie point of faith, or parte of Gods word what ſover, ſufficiently propoſed, is formal hereſie; then, that euerie hereſie, is dãnable, and deſtroi-

eth ſalvation: alſo, that al ſuch ſinful denial, deſtroieth true ſaving faith, true Church, and their vnitie and alſo Gods veracitie and conſequently his Deitie. Moreouer, that Communion in Sacraments or publik ſervice, with anie Church, that ſinfully denieth anie point of faith, is damnable. And al thes points I proue, by euident Teſtimonies of holie Scripture, and Fathers, and confirme them by reaſon, and confeſſion of Proteſtants. Which is the ſufficienteſt kinde of proof, that Proteſtants can deſire. After this, I shew that this diſtinction *of Fundamental* and *Not-fundamental points* in the Proteſtants ſenſe, hath no grownd in Scripture, Fathers, reaſon, or doctrin of Catholiks, as ſome Proteſtants pretend: but that the whole grownd therof, is mere neceſſitie to have ſome colorable shift to defend by it, Churches vincibly and ſinfully erring in ſome points of faith. And alſo, that though this diſtinction were admitted in their ſenſe, yet it would not ſuffice to defend

ſuch Churches, as Proteſtants endeauour to defend by it: becaus they are devided not only in not fundamental, but alſo in fundamental points: and moſt manifeſtly and vndeniably, in Communion of Sacraments and publik worſhip of God. Which Communion, I prove by Scripture, Fathers, reaſon, and confeſſion of Proteſtãts to be eſſential to a true Church, and what Churches are devided in this Communion, to be eſſentially deuided. And hence infer, that it is not enough to a true Church, or member thereof, or to the way of ſalvation, that one beleue al the fundamental points: But that it is alſo abſolutely neceſſarie, that he doe not ſinfully err in anie point of faith or in communion: and hee erreh ſinfully, who erreth, when the point of faith or cõmunion is ſufficiently propoſed to him, or for his fault is not ſo propoſed to him. And that Luther and his followers, who devided themſelves (as is evident alſo confeſſe by Proteſtants) from the whole viſible

VVhen error in faith is ſinful.

Chilling. c. 5. p. 273.

Church, in communion of Sacraments and publik worship of God, devided themſelues eſſentially, and from the eſſence of the whole viſible Church. And ſo were in no viſible Church. at al (becaus the whole, includeth al) or were in an eſſentially new made Church, as their communion in Sacraments and in their publik ſervice amoung themſelves, was ſubſtantially new, and not before, ether among themſelues, or among anie other Chriſtians. For a new eſſential part of a Church, which was not before, muſt needs make a new eſſential Church, which was not before.

Luther in leauing the communion of the whole Church, leaft her ſubſtance.

7. And becaus Proteſtants hold manie of the points of faith, which they held before their ſeparation: but hold no part of the Communion in Sacraments and publik worship of God, which they held before with the viſible Church, but haue made a quite new Communion among themſelues, in Sacraments and publik ſeruice, which Communion, nether they, nor anie Chriſtians before them,

Proteſtants hold ſome part of the Churches faith, but no part of her communion.

them, had: therfore they cannot diſtinguiſh Cõmunion into fundamental and not fundamental (as they do points of faith) nor can ſaie, they hold the fundamẽtal parte of their former Communion, and therby pretend, that they hold the ſubſtance of the ſame viſible Church, as they ſaie) they hold the fundamental part of the faith they had before, and by holding the fundamental parte of the faith of the viſible Church, pretend, they hold ſtil the ſame ſubſtance of the viſible Church. Wherupon our argument taken from their whole leauing the Communion of the whole viſible Church, in Sacraments and publik worship of God, (which is eſſential to the Church) is far more forcible to proue that they haue left the verie ſubſtance of the whole Church, and ſo are in no ſubſtantial Church, or in an other ſubſtantially new made, then that, which is taken from their leauing in parte, the faith of the whole viſible Church: though in truth both arguments be forcible enough, as we shal

Church, in communion of Sacraments and publik worship of God, devided themſelues eſſentially, and from the eſſence of the whole viſible Church. And ſo were in no viſible Church. at al (becaus the whole, includeth al) or were in an eſſentially new made Church, as their communion in Sacraments and in their publik ſervice amoung themſelves, was ſubſtantially new, and not before, ether among themſelues, or among anie other Chriſtians. For a new eſſential part of a Church, which was not before, muſt needs make a new eſſential Church, which was not before.

Luther in leauing the communion of the whole Church, leaft her ſubſtance.

7. And becaus Proteſtants hold manie of the points of faith, which they held before their ſeparation: but hold no part of the Communion in Sacraments and publik worship of God, which they held before with the viſible Church, but haue made a quite new Communion among themſelues, in Sacraments and publik ſeruice, which Communion, nether they, nor anie Chriſtians before them,

Proteſtants hold ſome part of the Churches faith, but no part of her communion.

them, had: therfore they cannot diſtinguiſh Cõmunion into fundamental and not fundamental (as they do points of faith) nor can ſaie, they hold the fundamẽtal parte of their former Communion, and therby pretend, that they hold the ſubſtance of the ſame viſible Church, as they ſaie) they hold the fundamental part of the faith they had before, and by holding the fundamental parte of the faith of the viſible Church, pretend, they hold ſtil the ſame ſubſtance of the viſible Church. Wherupon our argument taken from their whole leauing the Communion of the whole viſible Church, in Sacraments and publik worship of God, (which is eſſential to the Church) is far more forcible to proue that they haue left the verie ſubſtance of the whole Church, and ſo are in no ſubſtantial Church, or in an other ſubſtantially new made, then that, which is taken from their leauing in parte, the faith of the whole viſible Church: though in truth both arguments be forcible enough, as we shal

ſee P. 2. c. 6. 7. And Proteſtants knowing wel, that they haue no pretence to anie parte of the external Communion of the whole viſible Church, from which they departed, neuer proue themſelues to be of the true Church, becaus they reteine al, or the fundamẽtal parte of the Communion of the viſible Church: but only, becaus they reteine the fundamental points of faith: And ſpeak as ſeldom of Communion, as they maie, or if they ſaie, they haue Communion with the whole Church, they equiuocate, and by *Communion* vnderſtand charitie. Which nether is that Communion, which is eſſential to the viſible Church, nor is anie other, then they are bound to haue to infidels, and al that are out of the Church, to wit, to praie for them, wish, and do them good. And (I think) they wil be ashamed to ſaie, they haue no other kinde of Communion with the members of the Church, then they haue with infidels: See l. 2. c. 11. 12.

Proteſtants ſpeak not of communion but againſt their wil.

See c. 11.

Proteſtants haue no other communion with other Chriſtians, then with infidels.

8. Laſtly; I propoſe to the Reader, a ſumm of the Proteſtants vncertainties or contradictions, touched in this Treatiſe, that therby he maie viſibly ſee, that they are not certaine, what to ſaie, but merely make vſe of what ſerueth them for the time: and ſo, that al they ſaie, is but ſhifts for a time. For whiles they are racked by the euidence of truth, they confès, that al points of faith ſufficiently propoſed, are neceſſarie to a ſauing faith, to true Church, and to ſaluation: that ſinful denial of anie point of faith, is true hereſie, deſtroieth ſaluation, faith, Church, and vnitie thereof: That Communion in Sacraments and publik worship of God, is eſſential to the Church, and that for want therof, Sciſmatiks are out of the Church, and in ſtate of damnation. But when they look back vpon the Churches which they manteine, and ſee how they ſinfully denie ſome points of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them, or for their fault, haue them not ſufficiently propoſed to them, and are deuided,

Proteſtants confes truth whiles they are upon the rack.

partly in matters of faith, and wholy in Communion of Sacraments, and publik worship of God, they are forced to denie al that before they confeſſed, of ſauing faith, true Church, and true Communion. And the reaſon of this their inconſtancie, is, becaus they would ioine ſauing faith, with their faith, true Church, with their Church, true Communion, with their Communion. Which is as impoſſible, as to ioine truth with lies, life with death, heauen with hel. And whoſoeuer ſeeketh to ioine ſuch together, muſt needs, be, as the Scripture ſpreaketh, *vir duplex animo, inconſtans eſt in omnibus viis ſuis.* Wheras Catholiks (their faith, Church, and Communion, being true faith, true Church, true Communion) eaſily and without anie contradiction at al, ioine them together, and shew by the verie definitions of true faith, true Church, true communion, giuen by Scripture, and Fathers, confirmed by reaſon, and approued by Proteſtants themſelues, that their faith,

Iacob. 1.

their, Church, their communion, is true. And if Proteſtants would with indifferencie conſider this quite contrarie proceeding of Catholik and Proteſtant Writers, they would eaſily ſee, that they conſtantly defend truth, thes vnconſtantly make shifts for to to vphold vntruths for a time. But at length (as the Apoſtle ſaieth) *their follie wil be made manifeſt to al.* And as Saint Cyprian affirmeth: *This is true madnes, not to think or know, that lies do not long deceaue.* At length shifts wil appeare to be but shifts, and that which needeth them, to be vntruth.

2. Tim. 3.

Epiſt. 55.

9. And finally, out of al which, I haue ſaied, I conclude, that it is no way againſt charitie, but rather according to true Chriſtian faith and charitie, to tel al Churches and perſons, which err in anie point of Chriſtian faith, or in communion in Sacraments, ſufficiently propoſed, or who ſinfully err againſt anie point of faith, or communion in Sacraments, that whiles they doe ſo, they

Charitie, to warne ſinful errants of their danger.

are in ſtate of damnation, that being ſo warned of their error, they may correct it, and auoid damnation: And at laſt is breifly shewed, that Proteſtant Churches ſinfully err, both in points of faith, and in communion of Sacraments.

A CATALOGVE OF THE Chapters of the firſt Book.

I.

WHAT Proteſtants teach of fundamental and not fundamental points, and in what they differ therin from Catholiks.

II.

That Proteſtants teach, that ſome points of faith are ſo vnfundamental, as they are not neceſſarie to ſauing faith, true Church, or ſaluation, though they be ſufficiently propoſed.

III.

Why *Proteſtants diſtingush articles by thes metaphorical termes* Fundamental, Not fundamental, *rather then by thes proper termes,* Neceſſarie, Not neceſſarie.

IV.

That Proteſtants make great account, and great vſe of their diſtinctoin of Fundamental and Not fundamental points.

V.

That Proteſtants are vncertaine, what a Not fundamental point, is.

VI.

That Proteſtants are vncertaine, which are fundamental points, which are Not fundamental.

VII.

That Proteſtants are vncertaine, whether a true Church can err in fundamental points, or no.

OF THE SECOND BOOKE.

I.

THat there are points of faith, beſide thes principal articles, which are to be preached to al, and beleued of al.

II.

That ſinful denial of anie point of faith, is true hereſie.

III.

That ſinful denial of anie point of faith deſtroieth ſaluation.

IV.

That ſinful denial of anie point of faith deſtroieth true ſauing faith.

V.

Diuers errors of Proteſtants about the ſubſtance, and vnitie of ſauing faith, refuted.

VI.

That ſinful denial of anie point of faith, deſtroieth the ſubſtance of the Church.

VII.

That ſinful denial of anie point of faith, deſtroieth the vnitie of the Church.

VIII.

That to denie anie point of Chriſts doctrin ſuffieiently propoſed, is to denie his veracitie and Deitie.

IX.

That Communion with heretical Churches, or which ſinfully denie anie point of faith, is damnable.

X.

That their diſtinction of Fundamental, *and* Not fundamental points, *hath no ground in Scripture, Fathers, Reaſon, or doctrin of Catholiks.*

XI.

Though the Proteſtants diſtinction of Fundamental and Not fundamental articles were true, yet it would not ſuffice

for their purpos, for want of vnion in fundamental points.

XII.

That their distinction would not suffice, for their want of communion in Sacraments and publik worship of God.

XIII.

Proteſtants errors about communion, refuted.

XIV.

The Proteſtant and Cath. doctrin, about matters here handled, and their Defenders compared, and breſly shewed, that it is true Charitie, to tel ſinful errants in anie point of faith, or in communion, that they are in a damnable ſtate.

A RAISONABLE REQVEST to him, that wil ſeriously anſwer this Treatiſe, to ſaie directly, and plainly, yea, or no, to thes queſtions following, and conſtantly to ſtand to his anſuwer, in his whole Replie.

Whether Proteſtants, in their diſtinction into *fundamental*, and *not fundamental* points, doe intend to diſtinguish true points of faith: and meane, that *not fundamental* points, are true points of faith, or no? 1.

Whether ſinful error in anie true point of faith, or of Gods revealed word, can ſtand with ſaving faith, a true member of the Church, and ſalvation, or no? 2.

Whether there be not ſinful error, when anie point of faith is ſufficiently propoſed to a man, or, for his fault, not ſo propoſed, and yet not beleued of him, or no? 3.

Whether *fundamental points* be ſufficient to ſaving faith, true Church, 4.

and ſalvation even when *not fundamental points* or not principal points are ſufficiently propoſed, and not beleved, or ſinfully not beleved or no?

5. Whether *not fundamental* or *not principal* points be not neceſſarie to a ſaving faith, true Church, and ſalvation, when they are as ſufficiently propoſed, as points of faith ought to be, or would be ſo propoſed, if it were not our fault, or no?

6. Whether it be ſufficient to proue, ſome to have ſaving faith, to be true members of the Church, and in the waie of ſalvation, that they beleve al the *fundamental points*: and it be not alſo neceſſarie to prove, that they do not ſinfully err in anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them, or, which would be ſo propoſed, if it were not their avoidable fault, or no?

7. Whether, if it be neceſſarie to ſaving faith, true members of the Church, and to ſalvation, not to err ſinfully in anie point of faith ſuffi-

ciently propoſed, or which should be ſo propoſed, if it Were not the vnbelevers fault, it be not damnably to deceaue ſoules, to teach, that al who beleve the *fundamental points*, haue ſaving faith, are in the Church, and in waie of ſalvation, or no?

Whether ſinful error againſt anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed, or which would be ſo propoſed, if it were not the Errants avoidable fault, be formal hereſie, and al ſuch Errants, formal heretiks, or no? or if it be not hereſie, what ſin it is? 8.

Whether al formal hereſie, be not damnable ſin, and al formal heretiks, in ſtate of damnation, or no? 9.

Whether the Grecian, Lutheran, and ſuch other Churches, as Calviniſts grant to err in ſome points of faith, haue not had thos points ſufficiently propoſed to them, or might haue, if it were not their auoidable fault, or no? 10.

Whether, when Calviniſts ſaie, that Grecians, Lutherans, or ſuch erring Churches, have à ſaving faith, are in 11.

the true Church, and in waie of ſalvation, they meane even ſuch of them, as err vincibly, and ſinfully, or only ſuch as err invincibly?

12 Whether if they allow ſaving faith, true Church, and ſalvation to ſuch only, as err inuincibly in *not fundamental* points, they can pretend to haue more charitie to erring Chriſtians, then Catholiks haue, nor no?

13, Whether Communion in Sacraments, and in publik worship of God, be not eſſential to a true viſible Church, and for want therof pure Sciſmatiks, be out of the ſubſtance of the viſible Church, or no?

14. Whether they, who forsake the Communion of the whole viſible Church in Sacraments and in publik worship of God, doe not ſubſtantially forſake the whole viſible Church, or no?

15. Whether there can be iuſt cauſe to forſake the Communion of the whole Church, in her Sacraments, and publiks worship of God, and to inſtitute à new Communion, which none

before had, or no?

Whether, when Luther, and his Fellowes, forsook the Communion of the Roman Church in Sacraments, and in her publik worship of God, they did not forsake the Communion of the whole visible Church in Sacraments, and publik worship of God, and instituted a new Communion in Sacraments, and publik worship of God, which nether themselues had before, nor anie other Christian Church or no? 16.

Whether if Communion in Sacraments, and in publik worship of God, be essential to the visible Church, Luther and his fellowes, when they instituted a new Communion in such things which was not before, did not institute a new Church, which was not before? 27, 18.

Whether Churches, which differ both in Communion, and in al the formal essential parts of the visible Church, as in profession of faith, in Sacraments, and Ministers of the word, and of Sacraments (as the

Roman, and Proteſtants Churches differt) can be one, and the ſame ſubſtantial Church, or no?

19. If the Roman, and Proteſtant Churches, be ſubſtantially different Churches, how can both be true Churches, Proteſtants receaue the keyes of heauen, and Lawful Miſſion from a fals Church, or shew the continuance of their Church, by the continuance of the Roman?

20. Whether al Proteſtant Churches, erring in ſome points of faith (as Proteſtants confes they doe) doe not err ſinfully in ſuch points, as having them ſufficiently propoſed to them, or might have, if it were not their avoidable fault?

21. Whether it be not charitie, to tel al, that ſinfully err in ſome points of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them, or which would be ſo propoſed to them, if it were not their avoidable fault and therby are formal heretiks: or which ſinfully err in Communion of Sacraments, and publik worship of God, and therby are formal Sciſmaticks,

ticks, that they are in ſtate of damnation?

Whether, who denie ſome points of Gods word, propoſed as ſufficiently, as Gods word needeth to be, or which would be propoſed, if it were not their avoidable fault, do not implicitly denie God to be true in al his words, or no? 22.

Whether who implicitly denie God to be true in al his words, be not implicitly, Atheiſts, or no? 23.

Who wil goe cloſe to the matter, and bewraye no diſtruſt, ether of the truthe of his cauſe, or of his own certaintie therof, wil make no difficultie to anſwer to al thes queſtions directly and clearly yea or no, without making anie diſtinction, where there is no equiuocal terme; nor make anie ſhift to delude the plaine ſenſe of the words.

OF THE DISTINCTION OF FVNDAMENTAL AND NOT FVNDAMENTAL POINTS OF FAITH.

THE STATE OF THE queſtion, and difference betvveen Catholiks and Proteſtants, about Fundamental, and Not Fundamental points of faith, truly and clearly ſet dovvn.

FIRST CHAPTER.

Prima cauſa victoriæ, diligenter cauſam pro qua dicturus es, dicere Cicero.

THE true ſtating of the queſtion betwixt Catholiks and Proteſtants, is half the ending of it, and if it be wel obſerued, the queſtion wil be ſoon ended: and if it be not obſerued, the

diſpute wil be both fruitles and endles. For otherwiſe, the Diſputants wil talk of different matters, and the one not denie, what the other affirmeth, but ſome different thing. Wherfore, that the Reader maie plainely perceiue, wherin ſtandeth the point of controuerſie between Catholiks and Proteſtants concerning Fundamental and not fundamental points, he muſt wel note: that Catholiks do not ſimply denie the diſtinction of Fundamental and not Fundamental points of faith, but only denie it in the Proteſtants ſenſe. For that they grant ſome points of faith to be Fundamental, others not fundamental, is euident, both by their own ſayings, and Proteſtants confeſſion. For the Councel of Trent ſeſſ. 3. and the Catechiſme of the ſame Councel c. 1. and Catholik Diuines commonly, call ſome points, the foundation, or fundamental points, and conſequently muſt needs grant, that other points are not the foundation, or not fundamental. And this D. Potter ſec. 7. p. 79. proueth at

Gloſſa d 19. c. ita Dominus. Super illo articulo fidei (Tu es Chriſt⁹ &c.) fundata eſt Eccleſia.

Peron Epiſtle to K. Iames obſer. 3. Bellarm. l 4. de verbo Dei c. 11.

large out of Catholik writers: and the like hath L. Canterburie ſec. 38. and Chillingworth p. 159. And D. White in Defence of his way c. 17. ſaieth: *I know none of our aduerſaries, that denieth this diſtinction,* of Fundamental and not fundamental points. And Chillingworth in anſwer to the Preface, p. 16. *In our ſenſe of the word, Fundamental, I hope she (* Roman Church *) erred not fundamentally, but in your ſenſe of the word, I feare she did.* Which is plainly to confes, that Catholiks grant, that there are fundamental points, and that the difference betwixt them and Proteſtants, is about the ſenſe. So that the difference is not, whether there be fundamental and not fundamental points of faith, (for this both Catholiks and Proteſtants grant) but whether fundamental and not fundamental points of faith be ſuch, as Proteſtants would haue them to be, or no. And if anie Catholiks in words denie, that there are anie not fundamental points of faith, in deed they denie no more, then

None denie the diſtinction of fundamental and not fundamental.

L. Cant. p. 213. In your ſenſe fundamental.

that there anie ſuch not fundamental points, as Proteſtants teach.

2. For al Catholiks grant, that there is great difference among points of faith. For ſome points are ſimply and abſolutly neceſſarie to be actually beleued, in al ordinarie courſes, of al men that can beleue, actually, for to haue ſauing faith, to be members of the Church, and to be in waie of ſaluatiō: and therfore are to be preached to al kinds of men. And thes are alſo ſufficient to be beleued actually, to haue a ſauing faith, to be a member of the Church, and in waie of ſaluation, in ſome caſe, to wit, when the ignorance of other points is inuincible, or not faultie, becaus they are not ſufficiently propoſed, nor the Not-beleuers of them, are in anie fault, that they are not ſo propoſed. Such are the principal points of faith, as the Paſſion of Chriſt, and the like. There are other points of faith, which nether are ſufficient in anie caſe, to a ſauing faith, member of the Church, or waie of ſaluation: nor ſimply and abſolutly

D. Potter ſec 2. p. 47. ſec. 5 p. 5. ſec. 7. p. 74. L. Cant. p. 73. Chillingw. p. 263. 283.

Bellarm. l 3. de Eccleſ. c. 14.

neceſſarie to be actually beleued, but only conditionally, in caſe they be ſufficiently propoſed, or ould be ſo propoſed, if it were not the not beleuers auoidable fault. For otherwiſe, a virtual or intentional beleif of them, wil ſuffice to a ſauing faith, member of the Church, and waie of ſaluation. Such is, that Abraham had twoe ſonns, and the like. And the points of the firſt ſorte, maie wel be called *Fundamental*, not only becaus they be abſolutly neceſſarie to ſauing faith, Church, and ſaluation, as the foundation is abſolutly neceſſarie to a ho ſe: but alſo, becaus other points of faith relie vpon them, as other parts of a howſe relie vpon the foundation. And points of the ſecond ſorte, maie be termed *Not fundamental*, becaus they are not ſimply and abſolutly neceſſarie to be actually beleued, for to haue ſauing faith, to be a member of the Church, and in waie of ſaluation, as fundamental parts of a temporal building are ſimply and abſolutly neceſſarie to it: nor other points relie on

why ſome points may be called fundamenlal.

why others, not fundamental.

them, as other parts of a building relie on the foundation. But whether ſome points of faith, maie be called *Fundamental*, and others, *not fundamental*, is no great matter. For it is but a queſtion of words. The real queſtion, and that of great weight, is, whether the the principal points of faith (whether they alone maie be called *Fundamental*, or no) be ſo ſufficient to ſauing faith, to a member the Church, and waie of ſaluation, as the actual beleif of them wil ſuffice to the ſaid ends, though other points of faith be ſinfully vnbeleued, or (which cometh al to one) though other points be ſufficiently propoſed and not beleued, or would be ſufficiently propoſed, if it were not the vnbeleuers auoidable fault. And whether les principal points of faith (whether they maie be termed *Not fundamental* points, or no) be ſo vnneceſſarie to ſauing faith, mẽber of the Churc. and waie of ſaluatiõ, as they maie be ſinfully vnbeleued, and yet there maie be ſauing faith, member of the Church, or ſtate of

which is a verbal queſtion.

which a real.

ſaluation: or (which cometh al to one) maie be not beleued, nether virtually nor actually, though they be ſufficiently propoſed, or would be, if it were not the vnbeleuers fault, without los of ſauing faith, member of the Church or ſtate of ſaluation. For ſuch *fundamental* and *not fundamẽtal* points, Proteſtants affirme to be, and Catholiks vtterly denie there are anie ſuch; but ſaie that no points of faith are *ſo fundamental*, as they are ſufficient to ſauing faith, to a member of the Church, and ſtate of ſaluation, when anie other points of faith are ſinfully vnbeleued, or not beleued when they are ſufficiently propoſed, or would be, if it were not the vnbeleuers auoidable fault: Nor anie points of faith *ſo not fundamental*, as they are not really neceſſarie to ſauing faith, member of the Church, and ſtate of ſaluation, when they are as ſufficiently propoſed, as points of faith need to be, or wold be ſo propoſed, if it were not the vnbeleuers auoidable fault.

Proteſtants end in this their diſtinction.

3. And the end, why Proteſtants deuiſed this diſtinction of fundamen-

tal and not fundamental points in their forſaid ſenſe or rather, wreſted this diſtinction vnto their foreſaid ſenſe, is, for to defend ſome Churches or perſons to haue ſauing faith, to be true Churches, and in waie of ſaluation, who ſinfully err in ſome points of faith, ether becaus they wil not beleue them though they be ſufficiently propoſed, or are in fault, that they are not ſo propoſed: For. (as is ſaid) Not Fundamentals, in caſe of ſufficient propoſal, are neceſſarie to ſauing faith, Church, and ſaluation. Therfore Proteſtants take this diſtinction in a quite different ſenſe from Catholiks, and by *fundamental points*, mean ſuch, as (ſaie they) are not only abſolutly neceſſarie, but alſo abſolutly ſufficient (to ſauing faith, Church, and ſaluation) to be beleued, euen when other points are ſufficiently propoſed, and not beleued. And by *Not fundamental points*, mean ſuch, as are abſolutly Not neceſſarie to ſauing faith, Church, or ſaluation, to be actually beleued, euen when they are ſufficiently propoſed, or the Not-

In what ſenſe Proteſtants vnderſtād fundamental, and not fūdamental.

beleuers are in fault, that they are not ſo propoſed. And that Proteſtants made or vnderſtand this diſtinction of *fundamental* and *not fundamental* in this ſenſe, for to defend therby ſuch as ſinfully err in ſome points of faith, is euident by itſelf, and by thes words of Rouſe in his Treatiſe of Cath. Charitie c. 9. *This diſtinction was firſt framed, to giue leaue for difference in meaſure of faith.* For this meaſure of faith, he admitteth concerning points ſufficiently propoſed. Wherfore al the queſtion betwixt Catholiks and Proteſtants, about Fundamental and not fundamental points, is, Whether there be anie ſuch *fundamental points*, as the beleif of them, is ſufficient to ſauing faith, Church, and ſaluation, euen when ignorance or error in other points, is vincible and ſinful: or (which is al one) when other points are ſo ſufficiently propoſed, as points of faith need to be, or ſhould be, if it were not the Not-beleuers fault, and yet are not beleued. And whether, there be anie ſuch *Not fundamental* points of faith, as the actual

The points in queſtion, for fundamentals.

And for not fundamentals.

beleif of them is not neceſſarie to ſauing faith, Church, or ſaluation, when they are ſufficiently propoſed, and virtual or intentional beleif of them be neceſſarie, whether they be propoſed, or no: or (which cometh al to one) whether, *not fundamental* points be ſuch, as vincible and ſinful ignorance or error in them, maie ſtand with ſaing ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation. For ſuch *ſufficiencie* of fundamental points, and ſuch vnneceſſarines of not fundamẽtal points, to ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation Proteſtants affirme, and Catholiks vtterly condemn.

4. Proteſtants cal this diſtinction in their ſenſe, *Charitie*, or (as Rouſe termeth it) *Catholik Charitie*, becaus it affordeth ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation, vniuerſally to al that beleue the Capital or principal points of faith, howſoeuer ſinfully they beleue not other points. But firſt, this Charitie is not grounded in anie Word of God, (but rather is quite contrarie to it, as shal hereafter appeare) but only in ſome humane pittie, or rather

Proteſtants charitie.

But both vngrounded and fals.

fond flatterie of themſelues, and of others, who ſinfully err in ſome points of faith: and therfore is but ſeeming, and in truth, fals and deceiptful charitie. Secondly, it is quite oppoſite to true charitie, becaus it damnably deceaueth thoſe, who ſinfully err in not fundamental or ſecondarie points of faith, telling them, that though they beleiue them not, when they are ſufficiently propoſed, or when it is their fault, that they are not ſo propoſed, yet they haue ſauing faith, are in the true Church, and in way of ſaluation: Which is in truth to deſtroie the ſubſtance and vnitie of ſauing faith, of true Church, and of ſaluation; to excuſe al hereſies in ſecondarie points of faith from mortal or damnable ſin: to bring an indifference or libertiniſme in beleif or not beleif of Secondarie points of faith: to giue leaue to Sciſme, and to communion with heretiks; to reiect Gods veracitie in ſecondarie points of faith, and ſo to laie a ground of atheiſme, and finally (as Proteſtants ſometimes, conuinced by euidencie of truth, con-

See c. 8. n. 5. c. 10. n. 5. 6. L. Epiſt. to the King.

ſes) is infidelitie , and the giuing of the Lie to God. Wherfore in vaine do ſome , who teach this doctrin , complaine , that *Atheiſme and irreligion getteth ſtrength*, ſeing that to teach that ſome points of faith are ſufficient to ſauing faith , true Church , or ſaluation , and others , not neceſſarie , though thes be ſufficiently propoſed, or it be the not beleuers fault , that they are not ſo propoſed , is plaine Atheiſme and Irreligion. And therfore (as I ſaid in the Preface) this doctrin is not to be deteſted and impugned as a ſingle, or ſimple error in faith, but as a ground of al hereſies in ſecondarie points of faith , of Sciſme , of Infidelitie, and Atheiſme. For as long as they mainteine ſuch to be true Churches , to haue ſauing faith , and to be in the waie of ſaluation , which ſinfully err in ſome points of faith, or (which comes al to one) which beleue not ſome points of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them , or for their fault not ſo propoſed to thē , or communicate in Sacraments and publik Liturgie with ſuch Churches,

in vaine they denie, that they hold this doctrin. For their ſaid maintenance, or communion with ſuch Churches, is a real profeſſion of this doctrin, and wil force them to confes, that they hold it. But now let vs prove that Proteſtants both by words and deeds teach this doctrin, becaus they ſometimes (conſidering the horror of it) do denie, that they teach it. But this their Denial wil prove no more, then that they contradict themſelues, as is vſual for hereticks to doe, and that the doctrin is ſo horrible, as themſelues ſometimes are ashamed of it.

what is not here enquired.

I enquire not here, who is a ſufficient Propoſer of points of faith, to wit whether Sripture or Church, or both: nor, which is a ſufficient propoſal of points of faith: nor, what points of faith are ſufficiently propoſed. Neverthles manie and weightie points are here handled: For firſt is confuted that moſt fals and Atheiſtical doctrin, *that the principal or fundamental points of faith are abſolutly ſuf-*

what is here proued.

1.

ſufficient to ſauing faith, to a member of the true Church, and to ſaluation: So as if one beleve that, hee need not care (for ſo much as is to haue ſaving faith, to be a member of the true Church, and in waie of ſalvation) whether he beleve anie other points or no. Becaus (as is here proued) nether are they ſufficient to ſaving faith, in caſe that the les principal, or not fundamental points be ſufficiently propoſed, or would be ſo propoſed if it were not the Vnbelevers fault, and are not beleved: Nether though they were ſufficient even in that caſe to ſaving faith, were they ſufficient to a member of the true Church or to ſalvation, Becaus Communion in Sacraments and publik worship of God, is as neceſſarie to a member of the true Church, and to ſalvation, as faith is. Secondly, is here confuted the like fals and Atheiſtical doctrin: *That the les principal or not Fundamental points of faith are abſolutly vnneceſſarie to ſauing faith, to a mēber of the true Church, and to ſaluation, euen in caſe they be ſuf-*

2.

ficiently propoſed, or would be ſo propoſed, if it were not the Vnbeleuers auoidable fault: For it is here shewed, that the beleif of anie point of faith whatſoeuer, ſufficiently propoſed, is neceſſarie to ſauing faith, to a member of the
3. true Church, and to ſaluation. Thirdly here is confuted that like fals and Atheiſtical doctrin: *That al who beleue the principal fundamental points of faith, are of the true Church: and that a true Church, and a Church beleuing al the fundamental points, is al one.* For who beleue not a les principal, or not fundamental point of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them, or which would be ſo propoſed to them, if it were not their auoidable fault, are true heretiks, and ſuch Churches, true heretical Churches, and giue God the lie in thos points, though they beleue the principal, or fundamental points.
Fourthly it is shewed to be a vaine
4. proof: *That one is of the ſame Church with the Roman, becaus he beleueth al the Fundamental points of faith which the Roman Church beleueth.* Becaus virtual

tual beleif of al points of faith whatſoeuer, and actual beleif of al points ſufficiently propoſed, and alſo Communion in Sacraments and publik worship of God, is neceſſarie to be of the ſame Church with the Roman.
Fiftly is shewed, that ſauing faith cannot ſtand with ſin in matter of faith. 5.
Sixtly is shewed, that it is not only the greatnes of the matters in points of faith, which bindeth vs to beleve it, but eſpecially the authoritie of the Reuealer: which beeing equal in greather and leſſer points, equally bindeth vs to beleve them al when they are propoſed. 6.
Seventhly is shewed (though breifly and by the way) that Proteſtants generally ſpeaking, err ſinfully in not beleuing ſome points of faith: Becaus, beſids al other proofs, their own Miniſters confes that al their Churches err in ſome points of faith, and that they ſinfully err, appeareth, becaus ether they haue had them ſufficiently propoſed to them, or might haue, if it were not their auoidable fault. 7.

That Proteſtants teach, that Fundamental points are ſufficient, and Not Fundamental points vnneceſſarie to ſauing faith, to a true Church, and to ſaluation, euen vvhen Not fundamentals are ſufficiently propoſed.

SECOND CHAPTER.

Chillingw. confeſſeth, al points ſufficiētly propoſed, to be neceſſarie.

1 CHillingworth in his anſwer to Mercie and truth c. 4. p. 196. ſaith: *The main queſtion in this buſines, is not, what diuine Reuelations are neceſſarie to be beleued, or not reiected, when they are ſufficiently propoſed. For al without queſtion, al without exception, are ſo.* And in his anſwer to the Preface p. 11. affirmeth, that D. Potter auoucheth the ſame. True it is, that ſome times they ſaie, al diuine Reuelations ſufficiētly propoſed are neceſſarie, being forced therto by the euidencie of

truth, and their confeſſions we shal produce hereafter for confirmation of this truth: but true alſo it is, that often times they denie, that al ſuch truthes are neceſſarie to ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation, and they are forced to denie it, for to defend ſuch to be true Churches, to haue ſauing faith, and to be in the waie of ſaluation, which they cannot with anie probabilitie denie, but that they beleue not, and reiect ſome diuine reuelatiõs ſufficiẽtly propoſed to them, or which, (if it were not their fault) would be ſo propoſed. And their confeſſion of this truth ſometimes, doth not proue that other times they denie it not, but only, that they contradict themſelues herin; which is vſual for heretiks to doe. Beſids, Chillingworth doth not here expres, to what end, al diuine Reuelations ſufficiently propoſed, be neceſſarie, to wit, to ſauing faith, to a true Church, and to ſaluation: which is that, which he knew Catholiks affirme, and charge Proteſtants with the denial therof: but reſeruedly ſaith, that *al diuine Reuelations ſufficiently*

c. 3. n. 5. & 7.

Chillingw. ſpeaketh reſerued by not ſetting down the whole queſtion.

 Proteſtants denie al neceſſitie propoſed, are neceſſarie to be beleued (not telling to what they are neceſſarie:) which he maie meane, that they are neceſſarie to ſome other end, as to auoid ſuch *a fault, as* (c. 1. p. 38. he ſaith) *is incident to good and honeſt men.* Which kinds of fault maie ſtand with ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation. And if he had meant, that al diuine Reuelations ſufficiently propoſed, are neceſſarie to ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation, why did he not exprès it, euen then, when he endeauoured to cleare himſelf of the contrarie imputation?

2. But whatſoeuer he meant, I wil proue clearly, by Proteſtants words and deeds, by their direct and indirect ſayings, by their common Tenets or Principles, that indeed they mean, that al diuine Reuelations, though ſufficiently propoſed, are not neceſ-
1. ſarie to ſauing faith, to a true Church, and to ſaluation. For firſt they ſaie abſolutly, and without anie exception of ſufficient or not ſufficient Propoſal of not Fundamentals, that *Fundamentals* are ſufficient, nay

abundantly ſufficient to ſauing faith, to a true Church, and to ſaluation: And alſo abſolutely, that *not fundamentals*, are vnneceſſarie, and not neceſſarie. D. Andrewes Reſpon. ad Apologiam Bellarmini c. 1. *what is in the Creeds, and in the fowr Councels, is faith enough for vs.* D. Whitaker controu. 2. q. 5. c. 18. *wee ſaie it is ſufficient* (to the Church) *if truth be kept in the cheif and principal articles of faith.* The Confeſſion of Swiſſers in the Preface: *Mutual conſent in the principal points of faith, and in the right ſenſe, and brotherlie charitie, was to pious antiquitie abundantly ſufficient.* D. Potter ſec. 3. p. 69. *The main poſitiue truths, wherin al* (Proteſtants and Catholiks) *agree, are abundantly ſufficient to ſaluation.* Chillingw. c. 7. p. 408. *They that beleue al things plainly deliuered in Scripture, beleue al things fundamental, and are at ſufficiēt vnitie in matters of faith.* Lord Canterburie in his Relation ſec. 38. p. 372. *The Church can teach the foundation, and men were happie, if they would learn it, and the Church more hap-*

VVhat is faith enough for Proteſtants.

Sufficient.

See Caluin 4. c. 2. § 1. and c. 1. §. 12.

Abundantly ſufficient to ſaluation.

Sufficient to vnitie.

See Vsherin ſerm. before K. Iames p. 16. 28.

Only fundamentals neceſſarie to ſaluation.

pie, would she teach nothing but that, as neceſſarie to ſaluation. For certainely, nothing but that is neceſſarie. And for *not fundamentals* the ſame D. Potter ſec. 4. p. 96. ſaith: *Al neceſſarie or fundamental truth, is conteined in Scripture:* making *Neceſſarie*, and *Fundamental*, al one. And ſec. 3. p 71. ſpeaking of not fundamentals, ſaith: *By their own Confeſsion, the doctrins debated, are vnneceſſarie.* Chilling worth in Anſwer to the Preface n. 32. *Thoſe are not fundamental points, which are not neceſſarie.* c. 4. p 219. *By fundamental articles, we mean al thoſe, that are neceſſarie.* Ibid. p. 220. *By fundamental, we mean al, and only that, which is neceſſarie.* L. Canterb. ſec. 21. p. 141. ſpeaking of not fundamentals, ſaith: *The Church maie err in Superſtructures, and deductions and othey By, and vnneceſſarie truths*, Behold, how abſolutly, and without al exception, of ſufficient or inſufficient propoſal of not fundamental points, they teach that Fundamental points are ſufficient, and abundantly ſufficient to ſaving faith, to a true Church, and to ſalvation: that

Frith in Fox pag. 944. There are manie things in Scriptures, which we are not bound to beleue as an article of faith.

nothing but the Foundation is neceſſarie: that by *Fundamental*, they mean al, and only that, which is neceſſarie: and that not fundamental points, are not *neceſſarie, are By, and vnneceſſarie truths*. And why should they ſay thus abſolutly, and without anie exception that fundamentals are ſufficient and not fundamentals, not neceſſarie to faith, Church, and ſaluatiō, and not be abſolutly vnderſtood ſo, vnles they would not be vnderſtood, as they ſpeak, but vſe mental reſervation even in matters of faith? which al men condemn, and iuſtly, for it giueth occaſion of error in faith.

3. But that they mean, that Fundamental points are ſufficient to ſaving faith, true Church and ſaluation abſolutly, and in al caſes: and Not fundamentals, vnneceſſarie to thoſe ends, even in caſe of ſufficient Propoſal, is evident by divers other doctrins of theirs. For (as wee shal ſee her after) they teach, that ſome obſtinat heretiks, obſtinat Papiſts, and obſtinat

Lutherans, have ſaving faith, are in the true Church, and in waie of ſaluation: and obſtinacie is not, but where there is ſufficient Propoſal of truth, or it is the fault of the obſtinat, that there is not ſuch Propoſal. Beſids, they teach, that fundamental points make vp the Catholik faith, integrate and make vp the Bodie of Chriſtian religion; that in them conſiſts the unitie of ſauing faith; that they properly conſtitute a Church, eſſentially conſtitute a true Church, that a true Church, is al one, with a Church not erring in fundamentals: Breach in not fundamentals, is no breach in neceſſarie faith. D. Potter ſec. 7. p. 76. *The Dogmatical foundation of the Church, are thos grand and Capital Doctrins, which make vp our faith in Chriſt.* P. 78. *By Fundamental points of faith, we mean thoſe prime and capital doctrins of our religion, which make vp the Holie Catholik and Apoſtolik faith, that faith, which eſſentially conſtitutes a true Church, and a true Chriſtian* Ib. p 102. *In thos fundamental truths, conſiſts the vnitie*

Fund. make vp our faith.

Make vp the Cath. faith.

Eſſentially conſtitute a true Church

of faith, and of the Catholik Church. Item p. 73. 74. *By fundamental doctrins, we mean such Catholik verities, as principally and essentially perteine to the faith, such as properly constitute a Church.* And sec. 3. p. 60. *In which Protestants iudge the life, and substance of religion to be comprised.* And finally sec. 5. p 18. *A true Church, is al one, with a Church not erring in the fundation.* Chillingworth c. 3. p. 159. calleth fundamentals: *The Doctrins which integrate and make vp the Bodie of Christian Religion.* And ib. p 140. saith. *Not fundamental (id est) no essential parts of Christianitie.* Lord Canterburie in his Relat. sec. 38. p. 355. *Errors in things not absolutly necessarie,* (thos are his not fundamentals) *is no breach vpon the one sauing faith, which is necessarie.* And p. 360. *In things not necessarie, though they be diuine Truths also, Christian men maie differ, and yet preserue the one necessarie faith.* But surely, if fundamental points make up our faith in Christ, comprehend the life and substance of Religion, make up the Catholik

In them cõsists the life and substãce of Religion.

Integrate the bodie of Religion.

See also Vsher in his Serm. befor k. Iames.

faith, integrate and make vp the bodie of Chriſtian Religion: if in them conſiſteth the vnitie of ſauing faith, if they properly and eſſentially conſtitute a true Church, and a true Chriſtian: if a true Church be al one, with one not erring in the foundation: and if not fundamental points, be no eſſential parts of Chriſtianitie, nor breach in them, be anie breach in neceſſarie ſauing faith: our faith in Chriſt, the Catholik faith, the entire bodie of Chriſtian Religion, vnitie of ſauing faith, and the eſſence of a true Church, and of a true Chriſtian, shal remaine as long as fundamentals are beleued, though Not fundamentals euen ſufficiently propoſed, be not beleued, nor breach in theſe, can make anie breach in the eſſence or vnitie of a true Church, or of ſauing faith. The ſame alſo followeth out of their doctrin: That we maie not forſake the communion in Sacraments, of a Church, that erreth in not fundamentals, vnles she impoſe the profeſſion of them. Chillingworth c. 5,

As long as the eſſential parts are, the thing is.

3.

p. 307. *That it is not lawful to ſeparate from anie Churches communion, for errors not apperteining to the ſubſtance of faith, is not vniuerſally true, but with this exception, vnles that Church requires the beleif and profeſsion of them.* So that if she ſinfully err in not fundamentals ſufficiently propoſed, but require not the beleif of them, we maie not ſeparate from her Communion. Lord Canterburie ſec. 26. p. 196. ſpeaking of not fundamentals, ſaith abſolutely: *In non neceſſariis, in, or about things neceſſarie, there ought not to be contention to a ſeparation.* And ſec. 28. p. 139. *The whole Church cannot vniuerſally err in abſolute fundamental doctrins, and therfore there can be no iuſt cauſe to make a ſciſme from the whole Church.* So that if she ſinfully erred in not fundamentals ſufficiently propoſed, there were no iuſt cauſe of ſeparation. D. Potter ſec. 2. p. 39. *Amongſt wiſe men, each diſcord in Religion, diſſolues not the vnitie of faith or charitie.* Ib. *vnitie in thes matters, is verie contingent in the Church, now*

See him p. 181.

No ſeparation for not fundamentals.

 what more cleare, then that (according to thes men) we muſt not ſeparate from anie Church for error in not fundamètal points, though thes be ſufficiently propoſed: but only for errors in fundamental points, or for impoſing not fundamental errors? and conſequently, a Church ſinfully erring in not fundamental points ſufficiently propoſed, but not impoſing them upon others, is a true Church and we maie not ſeparate from her, but muſt communicate with ſuch an erring Church, which we maie not doe, if she be not a true Church.

4. 4. This ſame followeth evidently out of divers common tenets or principles of Proteſtants, as firſt: That al are of the Church, who hold the fundamental points, as is to be ſeen l. 1. of the Author of Proteſtancie c. 3. and 7. ſecondly, that puritie in fundamental points, is a certaine note of a true Church ib. c. 7. Thirdly that to prove one to hold al the fundamen-

tal points (without proving, that he erreth not ſinfully in other points) is à ſufficient proof, that he is of the true Church. Fourthly, that we maie lawfully communicate with al, that hold *not al things, but al things neceſſarie*, as ſpeaketh Chillingworth c. 5. p. 283. who p. 220. profeſſeth, that by *Neceſſarie*, he vnderſtandeth *fundamental*. Fiftly, that only fundamental points are of the ſubſtance of ſauing faith, Church, and ſaluation. Sixtly, that they haue more charitie to erring Chriſtians, then Catholiks haue. For if al be of the Church, who hold the Foundation: If puritie in fundamentals, be a ſure Note of a true Church: If Holding the foundation, be a ſure proof, that one is of the true Church: If only fundamental points, be of the ſubſtance of ſauing faith, Church, and ſaluation: and that we maie lawfully communicate with al, that hold the foundation, euidently it followeth, that ſuch as hold the foundation, but ſinfully err in not fundamental points ſufficiently pro-

Morton Appeale l. 4. c. 2. Proteſtãts cõmunicate with al, who fundamentally profes the faith of Chriſt.

poſed, are of the true Church. Beſids, if Proteſtants allow not ſauing faith, Church, and ſaluation, to ſuch, as ſinfully err in not fundamentals ſufficiently propoſed, they shew no more charitie to erring Chriſtians, then Catholiks doe. For we allow al to haue ſauing faith, to be in the Church, in waie of ſaluation (for ſo much as belongeth to faith) who hold the fundamental points, and inuincibly err in not fundamentals; becaus nether are theſe ſufficiently propoſed to them, nor they in fault, that they are not ſo propoſed, as is euident, and confeſſed by Chillingworth c. 7. p. 139. and 400. If therfore they wil ſeem more charitable, then we are, they muſt allow ſaluation to ſuch, as ſinfully err in not fundamentals, ether ſufficiently propoſed to them, or for their fault, not ſo propoſed. For to ſuch, we nether allow ſauing faith true Church, nor ſaluation. And as long as Proteſtants hold their common doctrins hitherto related, in vaine they denie, that they afford

Proteſtants haue no more charitie then Catholiks.

Cath. allow ſaluation to inuincibly errants in not fundamentals.

But not to vincibly errants in them.

ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation, to ſuch, as ſinfully err in not fundamental points ſufficiently propoſed. But now let vs ſee, both their doctrin, and deeds, towards heretiks; Papiſts, and Lutherans, and other erring Churches, which wil euidently conuince, that they afford ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation, to ſuch, as they account to err ſinfully in not fundamental points of faith.

5. And to omit, that ſometimes they teach, that not fundamental points are no points of faith, as we shal ſee c. 5. Whence it wil euidently follow, that beleif of them, is not neceſſarie to ſauing faith, or true Church, though they be ſufficiently propoſed, they teach, partly, that obſtinat error in not fundamental points is no true hereſie; nor ſuch obſtinat errants, true heretiks: partly, that al hereſie is not damnable. For thus Perkins in Galat. 5. v. 20. *Hereſie is an error in the foundation of Religion, which* (ſaith he) *I add, to diſtinguish it from errors about* 5.

Hereſie onely in fund. points.

Spalatenſis l. 7. c. 5. n. 40. *True and properly called hereſie, is in defect, where a true and fundamental article is denied, or not beleued.* Moulins contra Peron l. 1. c. 7. *I would not haue an error called hereſie, if it be in ſome ſmal matter, and not in the foundation of faith.* The Caſimirian Caluiniſts in their Admonition c. 4. p. 131. *An heretik is he, who diſſenteth from the Creed, and foundation of holie Scripture.* c. 7. p. 244. *Not al that err in the doctrin of Chriſt, but ſuch as are in error, which openly repugneth to the foundation of Religion, or from which followeth the euerſion of ſome parts of the foundation be heretiks.* Doctor Potter ſec. 7. p. 82. *The Creed is a diſtinctiue Note or character, ſeuering orthodox beleuers from Infidels, and heretiks.* So that, who beleue the Creed, are orthodox beleuers, and no heretiks, what other points ſoeuer they denie. And ſec. 4. p. 127. *Theſe errors of the Donatiſts* (about Rebaptization) *were not in them ſelues hereticall.* Yet were they in a point of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them

See Field l. 3. c. 3. Elienſis Tortura Torti p. 80. and wittenbergenſes præfat. ad Acta cum Patriar. Conſtant.

Beza ad defenſ Caſtal. p. 495. Hæreticos eſſe definio, non omnes qui ſunt Apoſtatæ & a veritate aberrantes.

to them. L. Canterb. ſec. 21. p. 141. *If the Church err in the foundation she Becomes Heretical.* Chillingworth c. 4. p. 209. *There are no damnable hereſies, but ſuch as are plainly repugnant to thes prime verities.* And p. 215. *There can be no damnable hereſie, vnles it contradict ſome neceſſarie truth.* And c. 5. p. 271. *Hereſie we conceaue an obſtinat defence of anie error againſt anie neceſſarie article of the Chriſtian faith.* And by *neceſſarie truth*, or *neceſſarie article*, he profeſſeth to vnderſtand *fundamental*, as is before shewed. So that, no error againſt anie point of faith, is hereſie, or at leaſt, not damnable hereſie, except it be againſt ſome fundamental point. And if it be not damnable, it maie ſtand with ſauing faith, and ſaluation. Naie they expreſly teach, that heretiks againſt not fundamental points maie be ſaued, and that heretical Churches, are true Churches: and yet heretiks cannot be without obſtinacie, nor obſtinacie without ſufficient Propoſal of the contrarie truth. D. Andrews Reſpon. ad Apol. *Here n. 2.*

 Proteſtants denie al neceſſitie Bellarm. c. 5. *Catholik and Heretik are not contrarie.* Hooker l. 3. p. 128. *Heretiks are not vtterly cut of from the viſible Church of Chriſt.* Whitaker controuer. 2. q. 5. c. 18. *If an Heretik muſt be excluded from ſaluation, that is, becaus he ouerthroweth ſome foundation. For vnles he shake or ouerthrow ſome foundation, he maie be ſaued.* And controuer. 4. q. 5. c. 3. *Al Heretiks are within the Church.* Alſted de natura Eccleſ. c. 9. *I ſaie abſolutly, heretiks are of the Church, except thoſe, who ouerthrow the foundamental articles.* Morton in his Impoſture c. 15. p. 413. *Nether do Proteſtants yeeld more ſaftie to anie of the Members of the Church of Rome in ſuch a caſe, then they doe to whatſoeuer heretiks, whoſe beleif doth not vndermine the fundamental doctrin of faith.* Doct. Potter ſec. 4. p. 111. *Euen in an heretical Church, ſaluation maie be had.* Lord Canterburie ſec. 21. p. 141. ſaith. An heretical Church, maie be a Church of Chriſt ſtil. And ſurely one maie be ſaued in a Church of Chriſt. More Aſſertions of Proteſtāts, that heretiks

Heretiks in not fundamētals may be ſaued.

are in the Church, and maie be ſaued, are to be ſeen l. 1. of the Author of Proteſtant Religion c. 3. And generally Proteſtants compare hereſie to a ſicknes, which deſtroieth not a man, as maie be ſeen in Pleſſie de Eccleſ. c. 1. Moulins in his Buckler ſec. 92. Lord Canterburie epiſt. to the King. Chillingworth c. 5. p. 265. 269. c. 6. p. 335. and others. And ſeing the ſin of hereſie, cannot be without obſtinacie, as is euident, and Proteſtants confes: nor obſtinacie, but where there is ſufficient propoſal of the truth, or ſinful want of ſuch propoſal, manifeſt it is, that Proteſtants do think, that ſinful and obſtinat error in ſome points of faith, can ſtand with ſauing faith, Church, and ſaluation.

L. Canterb. p. 315. D. Potter ſec 4. p. 120. Chillingw. p. 271.

6. The ſame is alſo cleare by what they profes of Papiſts, or of the Roman Church. For Proteſtants commonly profes, that the Romã Church is a true Church, hath ſauing faith, and is in ſtate of ſaluation, as maie be ſeen l. 1. of the Author of Proteſtant Religion c. 2. Here I wil add the like pro-

Proteſtants ſaie the Ro. Church is a true Church

feſſion of ſome later English Proteſtants. Lord Canterb. ſec. 20. p. 128. 129. *The Roman Church, is a true Church in ſubſtance and eſſence.* Sec. 26. p. 192. *Proteſtants haue not leaft the Church of Rome in her eſſence, nor in things which conſtitute a Church.* Sec. 35. p. 311. *She is a Member of the Catholik Church.* Ib. p. 285. *Manie Proteſtants indeed confes, there is ſaluation poßible to be attained in the Roman Church.* p. 282. *The poßibilitie of ſaluatiõ* (in the Roman Church) *I think cannot be denied.* Sec. 38. p. 338. *That the Ladie might be ſaued in the Roman faith or Church, I confes.* Doctor Potter ſec. 1. p. 11. *we yeeld her* (Roman Church) *a member of the Catholik* (Church) ſec. 3. p. 74 75. *we acknowledg her a member of the bodie of Chriſt.* Ib. p. 78. *we beleue their* (Roman) *religion ſafe, that is, by Gods great mercie not damnable to ſome, ſuch as beleue what they profes.* And p. 62. *Proteſtants yeeld them the ſubſtance of a Chriſtian Church.* The like he hath p. 66. 81. Chillingworth in anſwer to the preface p. 15. and 16. faith of the Roman Church:

Saluation in Rom. faith.

Rom. Religion ſafe.

She was (before Luther) *a parte of the whole Catholik Church.* c. 1. p. 42. *Though D. Potter doth not take it il, that you beleue yourſelues maie be ſaued in your Religion yet, &c.* c. 2. p. 85. *The Roman Church is a parte of the Catholik Church.* c. 3. p. 163. *Our hope is, that the truths ſhe retaines, and the practiſe of them, maie proue an antidote to her, againſt the errors ſhe mainteines, in ſuch perſons as in ſimplicitie of heart follow this Abſolon. Thes points of Chriſtianitie, which haue in them the nature of an antidote againſt the poiſon of al ſins and errors, the Church of Rome, though otherwiſe much corrupted, ſtil retaines: therfore we hope she errs not fundamentally, but ſtil remaines a parte of the Church. And theſe errors, though to them that beleue them, we hope wil not be pernitious, yet &c.* c. 5. p. 282. *we hope your errors are not abſolutely vnpardonable.* p. 285. *our and your ſaluation not deſperatly inconſiſtent.* c. 7. p. 401. *D. Potter ſaieth indeed, that our not cutting of your Church from the bodie of Chriſt, and the hope of ſaluation, frees vs from the*

Antidote againſt al errors.

 Behold the Roman Church, is a true Church in substance and essence, hath the things which constitute a Church, is a member of the Catholik Church, a member of the bodie of Christ, is not cut from the bodie of Christ, nor hope of saluation, retaines thos points of Christianitie, which haue in them the nature of an antidote against al sinns and errors: possibilitie of saluation in her, cannot be denied, men maie be saued in the Roman faith and Church, her Religion is safe to such, as beleue what they profes, her errors wil not be pernitious to them, that beleue them.

And yet saie she erreth sinfully and obstinatly.

7. And neuertheles thes same men saie, that the same Roman Church is obstinat, and conuicted of her errors, and obstinacie cannot be, but where the truth is sufficiently propосed, or would be, if it were not the vnbeleuers fault. Doctor Potter sec. 5. p. 26. *The Protestants expresly accuse this* (Roman) *Church, and haue conuicted her to, as they think, of manie gros and dangerous*

See Caluin 4. Instit. c. 2. § 6.

Ro. Church conuicted.

errors. p. 14. *She is ſenſeles of her errors, and careles to ſeek anie remedie.* And ſec. 3. p. 65. *The firſt Reformers ſaw Rome in loue with her errors, ſo as she would not be cured.* Chillingworth c. 6. p. 373. ſaieth. The Roman Church *is accuſed and conuicted of manie damnable errors.* And c. 3. p. 163. *is moſt incorrigible.* c. 5. p. 280. *Mainteines errors with obſtinacie.* And ib. p. 295. *would not be reformed, is obſtinat in her corruptions.* And p. 303. *Papiſts are obſtinat in their common ſuperſtition.* Lord Canterburie ſec. 20. p. 133. *You thruſt vs from you, becaus we called for truth.* ſec. 21. p. 144. *They are reſolued to alter nothing.* King Iames in anſwer to C. Peron. *Their purpoſe is, conſtantly to mainteine al they hold.* Morton in his impoſture p. 404. *To hereſie and Idolatrie, your Church ioineth obſtinacie.* So that a Church conuicted of errors in faith, which is obſtinat and ſenſeles of them, which is incorrigible, reſolued to alter nothing, but to hold conſtantly al she holds, is, notwithſtanding al this, a true Church in ſubſtance, a member

Senſeles of her errors.

Incorrigible

Obſtinat.

vvil alter nothing.

of the Catholik Church and bodie of Chriſt, reteines al things that conſtitute a Church, hath poſſibilitie of ſaluation, her religion is ſafe to ſuch as beleue, as they profes, her errors not pernitious to them who beleue them. And is not this plainly to teach, that a Church ſinfully erring in ſome points of faith, hath ſauing faith, is a true Church, and in waie of ſaluation?

L. Canterb. p. 35. 285. D. Potter ſec. 3. p. 46. Chillingw. p. 282. 398. 400. 32.

8. Nether wil it help them to ſaie (as ſometimes they doe) that when they confes the Roman Church to be a true Church, to haue ſauing faith, and to be in the waie of ſaluation, by *Roman Church*, they mean only thoſe, who vpon inuincible ignorance follow her Religion. Firſt, becaus this is ſaid voluntarily, without anie ground giuen in the places, where they confes this of the Roman Church. Where, if they meant only of the ignorants in the Roman Church, why did they not name them, rather then the Roman Church?

By Roman Church can not be meāt only inuincibly ignorants.

2. 9. Secondly, becaus they ſaie thus,

only, when we, out of their grant, that the Roman Church is a true Church, hath ſauing faith, and true waie of ſaluation, doe clearly infer, that the Proteſtants Church, is no true Church, hath no ſauing faith, nor waie of ſaluation. And haue no other cauſe to expound themſelues thus, but Becaus otherwiſe they ſhould condemn their Church, and religion. Thirdly, 3.
becaus this is to profes, that they equiuocate in a matter of religion, becaus nether we, nor themſelues commonly, doe by *Roman Church*, vnderſtand only thoſe, who in her, are invincibly ignorant. And if Chillingworth ſaie c. 7. p. 399. *By Roman Church, to vnderſtand the ignorant members of it, is a verie vnuſual Senecdoche:* much more vnuſual is it, by *Roman Church*, to vnderſtand them alone. And yet (as the ſame man ſaieth c. 2. p. 57.) *Men ſhould ſpeak properly, when they write of Controuerſies in Religion.* And, (as Caluin addeth) *Plaine dealing is to be vſed in al things, but cheifly in matters of faith.* And if Proteſtants,

when they ſaie, *The Roman Church is a true Church*, had only meant the inuincibly ignorants in her, it had been eaſie for them, to haue ſaid ſo, and therby giuen no occaſion to miſtake their meaning. Fourthly, it is againſt their own deſcriptions of the Roman Church. Morton in his impoſture c. 14. ſec. 12. *The Church of Rome conſiſteth of a Pope, and his ſubordinats, as of a head, and a bodie.* And c. 4. *No people, can be called the Church of Rome, except they be Profeſſors of the faith of Rome.* The like he hath c. 2. p. 13. Feild in Apendice parte 3. *The Roman Church, that now is, is the multitude of ſuch only, as magnifie, admire, and adore the plenitude of Papal power, or, at leaſt, are content to be vnder the yoak of it ſtil.* White in defence of his Waie c. 33. *The Church of Rome is the Papacie.* Sutclif l. 1. de Eccleſia c. 6. *We muſt firſt tel, what we, and our Aduerſaries meane, by the Church of Rome. I ſaie, that the Church of Rome, is a multitude vnder one Head, the Biſhop of Rome, and agreeing in the publik doctrin of the Biſhop of Rome, and*

4. *VVhat Proteſtäts mean by Roman Church.*

the external worship, and Rites of that Church. Rainolds l. 2. de Idolalatria, c. 1. *By the name of the Roman Church, I meane al thos, who defile themſelues with the ſuperſtition of Rome, and communion of the Pope.* Whitaker controu. 2 q. 5. c. 5. p. 506. *I eſteeme the Papiſtical Church, not by number of men, but of Profeſſors: And they cannot be truly, called Profeſſors, but who vnderſtand, and beleue, what they profes:* Al which definitions, or deſcriptions of the *Roman Church,* or *Church of Rome,* ether only, or cheifly agree to them, who wittingly embrace her doctrin and communion.

10. Fiftly this expoſition of the *Roman Church,* is againſt the profeſſion of the English Proteſtant Church. For (as Rouſe writeth in his Catholik charitie c. 2.) *The Roman Church (according to the Church of England) is to be vnderſtood of the Pope, and his adherents.* And in the margin citeth the Homelie on Whitſontide. And c. 3. *The Church of Rome beeing vnderſtood, (as before) according to the words of the* 5.

Church of England, to be the Pope, and his adherents, &c. And doubtles, the adherents to the Pope, are not only inuincible ignorants, but ether only, or chiefly, the intelligents. Sixtly, becaus thēſelues ſometimes declare, that when they ſaie the Roman Church, is a true Church, they meane euen thos, who wittingly follow her doctrin. For Doctor Potter ſec. 1. p. 10. hauing called her, *the curſt Dame of Rome, who takes vpon her to reuel in the houſe of God, who hath manie waies plaid the Harlot, and in that regard, deſerued a bil of diuorce from Chriſt, and deteſtation from Chriſtians*: ſaith in the next page. *Yet for thoſe Catholik verities which she retaines, we yeeld her a member of the Catholik.* Is not this plainly to confes, that the moſt obſtinat parte of the Roman Church, is not yet diuorced from Chriſt, and is ſtil a member of the Catholik Church? Moreouer ſec. 3. p. 74. 75. *we acknowledg* (ſaith he) *the Church of Rome a member of the bodie of Chriſt, and this cleares vs from imputation of Sciſme,*

The curſt Dame of Rome is a member of the Cath. Church.

See Vſher Serm. before K Iames p. 26.

whoſe propertie it is, to cut of from the bodie of Chriſt, and hope of ſaluation, the Church, from which it ſeparates. And the ſame defendeth Chillingworth c. 5. p. 266. But they ſeparated themſelues from the Pope and his adherents; Therfore thoſe, they muſt account mẽbers of the bodie of Chriſt, and in hope of ſaluation, or they cleare not themſelues from ſciſme: Montague alſo l. orig. Eccleſ. parte poſter. p. 408. ſaith: *The Bishop of Rome is a parte, and a Cheif, of the vniuerſal repreſentatiue Church.* And if the Pope be a parte, ſurely al Papiſts are.

7. Seuenthly, if they did allow no Papiſts to be of the Church, or in waie of ſaluation, but only the inuincibly ignorants, they could pretend no more charitie to Papiſts, then we haue to Proteſtants. For (as Chillingworth writeth c. 7. p. 398. *Ignorant Proteſtants maie be ſaued by the cõfeſſion of Papiſts.* The ſame he hath c. 5. p. 308. And c. 1. p. 34. *According to the grownds of your own Religion, Proteſtants maie die in their ſuppoſed error, ether with ex-*

Ib. p. 400. Material heretiks, you do not exclude from poſſibilitie of ſaluation;

cuſable ignorance, or with contrition, and if they doe ſo, maie be ſaued. which is true, if he mean of inuincible ignorance: but ſuch are no true or formal Proteſtants, ſuch are rather Proteſtantibus credentes, then Proteſtantes, becaus wittingly they hold no point of true Proteſtancie, but the Capital points of Chriſtianitie, which are the Capital points of Papacie. But howſoeuer they can equiuocate in the name of *Roman Church*, becaus they can take that for different kinds of men, *ignorants* and *intelligents*, and ſaie, that when they affirme the Roman Church to be a true Church, and a member of the Catholik Church and bodie of Chriſt, they mean only the inuincibly ignorants, and not thoſe who wittingly follow her doctrin: how can they equiuocate in the name of *Roman faith*, or *Roman Religion*, which is not of two kinds, as its Profeſſors are, but one only, and includeth the pretended errors of Rome, as is euident by that Epitheton *Roman*, when they ſaie, *men maie be*

ſaued in the Roman faith, or Roman Religion is ſafe to ſuch, as beleue what they profes, that her religion hath antidotes againſt al errors, or ſinns, that her errors wil not be pernitious to them, that beleue them, and withal profes, (as Chillingworth doth c. 6. p. 375. *By your Religion I vnderſtand that, wherin you al agree, or profes to agree, the doctrin of the Councel of Trent.* Is not this to confes, that euen thoſe, who wittingly follow the Roman faith, or Religion, (which is the doctrin of the Councel of Trent) maie be ſaued, if they beleue as they profes?

Perkins initio problematis.

what is the Rom. Religion.

9. An other thing, which conuinceth the Caluiniſts, that they hold, that a true Church, ſauing faith, and ſtate of ſaluation, maie ſtand with ſinful errors in ſome points of faith ſufficiently propoſed, or with faultie want of ſuch propoſal, is their mainteining, that the Lutherans are a true Church, haue ſauing faith, and maie be ſaued: who yet ſinfully err in ſome points of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them, or at the leaſt, which would be ſo pro- 8.

poſed to them, if it were not their fault, which is al one, touching ſin. For (as Doctor Potter ſaith ſec. 7. p. 109.) *In this caſe, the difference is not great, between him, that is wilfully blinde, and him, that knowingly gainſaith the truth.* See alſo Chillingworth c. 7. p. 404. That Caluiniſts grant the Lutherans to be their Brothers in Chriſt, is euident by the Apologie of the Church of England, and generally by their deeds and writings. Here I wil only ſet down the Profeſſion of Chillingworth in his Preface, n. 39. *I hold the doctrin of al Proteſtants free from al impietie, and from al error deſtructiue of ſaluatiō, or in itſelf damnable:* and the Decree of the French Proteſtants in their Synod at Charenton, an. 1631. in thes words. *The Synod declareth, that ſeing the Churches of the Confeſſion of Ausbourg* (Lutherans) *do agree with the other Reformed Churches, in the Principles, and fundamental points of their Religion, the faithful of that Confeſſion, who with the ſpirit of charitie and truly peaceable, doe come to the publik*

See D. Potter ſec. 3. p. 89.

Caluiniſts cōmunicate in Sacraments with erring Lutherans.

publik Assemblies of the Churches of this Kingdom, and desire their Communication, maie without making abiuration, be receaued to the supper of the Lord. Behold Lutherans admitted of Caluinists to their Communion, without making abiuration; which is to confes, that they hold errors worthie to be abiured. And the reason, why they are admitted with their errors, is not becaus they sin not in them, or they are not sufficiently proposed to them, but becaus they are not fundamental errors. Nether is it likelie, that Lutherans that liue in France among Caluinists, should not haue their errors sufficiently proposed vnto them. (For this were to condemn the Caluinists of want, both of zele to their Religion, and also of charitie to their erring Brethren) or at the least, they might haue their errors sufficiently proposed to them, if it were not their fault. Besids, Caluin contra Hessusium p. 843. Withaker controu. 2. q. 5. c. 8. and other Caluinists generally affirme, that Lutherans are

obſtinat in their errors. But that, which conuinceth, that Caluiniſts account as Brothers, euen ſuch Lutherans, as are obſtinat in their errors ſufficiently shewed to them, is, that Zuinglius, and his fellowes in their Conference at Marpurg with Luther and his Mates, deſired to be held for Brethren of the ſame Church, by Luther and his. And the ſame requeſted Beza and his companions, of Smidelin and his fellowes, in their Conference at Montbelgard, though to their faces they mainteined their errors. See Hoſpinian parte 2. hiſtoriæ Sacrament. An. 1529. 1386. Had not Luther his errors ſufficiently shewed to him by Zuinglius, and Smidelin, by Beza, or at the leaſt might they not haue had, if it had not been their fault? And yet Zuinglius and Beza accounted them for Brethren of the ſame Church, and deſired to be accounted ſuch of them: but could not obteine it.

Note this.

Al Proteſtants err in ſome points of faith.

10. Moreouer Proteſtants generally confes, that euerie one of their Churches erreth in ſome points of

faith. And that they err ſinfully, is euident. For ether they haue thos points, in which they err, ſufficiently propoſed to them by their Miniſters, or might haue; if it be not ether their fault, or their Miniſters fault. Caluin. 4, Inſtit. c. 1. §. 12. *Ether we muſt leaue no Church at al, or we muſt pardon errors in thoſe things, which maie be vnknown without breach of the ſumm of religion.* Whitaker controu. 2. q. 5. c. 8. *It is not needful, that al should think the ſame: if ſuch vnitie be required, there would be no Church at al.* Bucer in his diſpute at Cambridg p. 481. *There is no Church on earth, which erreth not in faith, as wel as in manners.* Morton Apologie l. 1. c. 68. *Only Papiſts chaleng priuiledg of not erring.* Doctor Potter ſec. 2. p. 38. *It is a great vanitie to hope or expect, that al learned men in this life should abſolutly conſent in al peeces and particles of diuine truth.* p. 39. *vnitie* (in points not fundamental) *is verie contingent in the Church, neuer abſolute in al particles of truth.* Item: *Among wiſe men, each diſcord in Religion diſſolues not the*

The Church maie not hope to triumph ouer al error, til it be in heauen. Lord Canterburie ſec. 33. p. 360. *This* (that al agree in al points of faith) *cannot be hoped for, til the Church be Triumphant.* Chillingworth c. 5. p. 279. *The viſible Church is free indeed from al error abſolutly deſtructiue and vnpardonable, but not free from al error, which in itſelfe is damnable.* Thus plainly they confes, that al Proteſtants Churches err in ſome points of faith, that they muſt pardon errors which are not againſt fundamẽtal points, or haue no Church at al: that each diſcord in Religion diſſolues not vnitie in faith. And if Miniſters haue ſufficiently propoſed thes errors to their Churches, or would ſo do, if it were not their Churches fault, ether they haue no true Church, or it maie be a true Church, which ſinfully erreth in ſome points of faith, and communion with ſuch an erring Chnrch, is lawful.

See whites way p. 110. Montacute part. poſter. orig. p. 408.

8. 11. Finally, ſometime Proteſtants ſeeme plainly to confes, that ſauing

faith, true Church, and ſaluation, can ſtand with ſinful error in ſome points of faith, For thus write the Diuines of Caſimire in their admonit. c. 7. p. 246. *we offer ourſelues to mainteine Brotherhood with Lutherans, from which thes diuines exclude vs, euen this diſſention in doctrin remaining.* Chillingworth c. 1. p. 38. *To oppoſe that, which he might know to be the word of God, were he void of preiudice, is a fault I confes, but a fault, which is incident to good and honeſt men very often.* Loe, to oppoſe that, which one maie know to be Gods word, were it not his fault, is no damnable ſin, but ſuch, as is incident to good, and honeſt men. Is not this to excuſe ſinful oppoſition of Gods word from damnable ſin, and to ſaie, that ſaluation maie ſtand with ſinful oppoſition of Gods word? And c. 3. p. 139. *He only in fact affirmes, that God doth deceaue or is deceaued, who denies ſomething, which himſelf knowes or beleues to be Gods reuealed word.*. And vpon this doctrin, be excuſeth p. 39. and 40. al Proteſtants from damnably erring,

Sinfully to oppoſe Gods word, no mortal ſin.

becaus they do not oppoſe, what they know God hath teſtified: and ſaith p. 40. *They only err damnably, who oppoſe, what they know God hath teſtified.* And c. 3. p 135. *Without anie, the leſt dishonour to Gods veracitie, I maie doubt or denie ſome truth reuealed by him, if I nether know nor beleue it to be reuealed by him.* Is not this plainly to ſaie, that they only err damnably, who oppoſe what they know or beleue to be reuealed? and ſo they err not damnably, who oppoſe that, which is ſufficiently propoſed to them, but nether beleue, nor know it to be Gods word? Is not this to excuſe al oppoſers of Gods word, vpon ſinful or affected ignorance, from damnable ſin, or anie dishonour to Gods veracitie? For thes nether know nor beleue it to be Gods word: And to ſaie, that error in faith vpon ſinful or affected ignorance, maie ſtand with ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation? Lord Canterburie ſec. 35. p. 285. *Proteſtants ſaie, that the errors of the Roman Church, are ſo manie, and ſome ſo great, as*

No dishonour to Gods veracitie.

weaken the foundation, that it is verie hard to goe that waie to heauen, eſpecially to thē, that hauc had the truth manifeſted. Lo, euen thos Papiſts, who haue had the truth manifeſted, maie goe to heauen, though verie hardly. Is not this to ſaie, that ſauing faith and ſaluation maie ſtand with vnbeleif of truth manifeſted? Ib. p. 282. *The poſſibilitie of Papiſts ſaluation, I think cannot be denied, to the ignorants eſpecially, becaus they hold the foundation: but a ſecure waie they cannot goe, who hold with ſuch corruptions, when they know them*; Behold againe, a poſſible waie, though not ſecure, euen for thoſe Papiſts, who hold corruptions, when they know them. Is not this to grant ſauing faith, and poſſibilitie of ſaluation, where not only truth is ſufficiently propoſed, but alſo known corruptions are followed? And p. 299. *I doe for my parte acknowledg a poſſibilitie of ſaluation in the Roman Church, but ſo, as that which I grant to Romaniſts, is not as they are Romaniſts, but as they are Chriſtians, that is, as they beleue the Creed,*

Saluation maie ſtand with vnbeleif of truth manifeſted.

with holding known corruptions.

Saluation maie ſtand with witting aſſociation to groſ ſuperſtitions

 Proteſtants denie al neceſsitie and hold the foundation, Chriſt himſelf: not as they aſſociate themſelues wittingly and knowingly to the gros ſuperſtitions of the Roman Church. Behold againe, poſſibilitie of ſaluation granted euen to thos Romaniſts, who *wittingly and knowingly* aſſociate themſelues to the gros ſuperſtitions of the Roman Church; And haue not they truth ſufficiently propoſed to them, who wittingly and knowingly aſſociate themſelues to gros ſuperſtitions? Nether hindereth it, that he granteth not poſſibilitie of ſaluation to Romaniſts, as they aſſociate themſelues wittingly to gros ſuperſtitions. For it ſufficeth vs, that he granteth poſſibilitie of ſaluation to thos ſame Romaniſts, who ſo aſſociate themſelues to ſuperſtitions, for to proue, that they grant, that poſſibilitie of ſaluation maie be in the ſame men, with witting and known aſſociation to gros ſuperſtitions: which is more then I needed to proue. For it ſufficed me to proue, that Proteſtants teach, that ſauing faith, and ſaluation may ſtand with

ſinful denial of ſome reuealed truths ſufficiently propoſed: And here ſaluation is granted euen to thos, who aſſociate themſelues to known gros ſuperſtitions: which is far more, and far worſe. For he that doth aſſociate himſelf to gros ſuperſtitions only ſufficiently proued, doth not aſſociate himſelf to known ſuperſtitions, but only which might be known of him. But who doth wittingly and knowingly aſſociate himſelf to gros ſuperſtitions, doth aſſociate himſelf to known gros ſuperſtitions. Finally ſec. 32. p. 226. *when they know it, if the error be not manifeſtly againſt fundamental veritie, I would haue al wiſe men conſider, whether external obedience be not euen then to be yeelded.* Lo external obedience to be yeelded to known error in not fundamentals. Be it therfore certaine, that howſoeuer Chillingworth or Doctor Potter ſaie, that al diuine reuelations without queſtion or exception, are neceſſarie to be beleued or not reiected, when they are ſufficiently propoſed; or that other

External obedience to known error.

Proteſtants denie they teach, that *Fundamental* points are ſufficient, and *not fundamental*, not neceſſarie to ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation, euen when *not fundamentals* are ſufficiently propoſed, and denie, that ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation can ſtand with ſinful error in ſome points of faith, Proteſtants do plainly teach ſo, and muſt teach ſo, as long as they defend ſuch Churches as they doe, and communicate with ſuch, and hold their foreſaid common Tenets and Principles: and ſome ſaie more, to wit, that ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation, maie ſtand not only with ſinful error of ſome points of faith ſufficiently propoſed, but alſo with profeſſion or aſſociation *to known gros ſuperſtitions*. And I haue been the longer in prouing, that Proteſtants hold the foreſaid doctrin, that ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation, may ſtand with ſinful error in ſome points of faith, partly, becaus ſometimes they denie, that they hold it, partly, becaus to haue diſ-

couered it, is half to haue refuted it, it being ſo deteſtable, as indeed it is. Now let vs ſee, why Proteſtants make, or vſe the diſtinction of points of faith, rather by thes Metaphorical and ambiguous termes, *Fundamental, Not fundamental*, then by thes proper and cleare termes, *Neceſſarie, Not neceſſarie*. For it is not without cauſe, that they choſe improper and obſcure termes, rather then proper and cleare.

VVhy Proteſtants diſtinguish points of faith by the Metaphorical termes Fundamental, Not Fundamental, rather then by proper termes, Neceſſarie, Not-Neceſſarie.

THIRD CHAPTER.

Chillingw. c.4.p.225.

PRoteſtants confes (and it cannot be denied) that the word *Fundamental is Metaphorical and ambiguous*,

Chillingw. p.219.220.

and profes ſometimes by *Fundamental* to vnderſtand *Neceſſarie*: and neuertheles they rather make diſtinction of points of faith into *Fundamental*, and *not Fundamental*, then into *neceſſarie*, and *not neceſſarie*. And the reaſon hereof, is, partly becaus vnder theſe ambiguous termes, *Fundamental*, *not Fundamental*, they can better couer the fowlnes of their doctrin, whereof we ſpeake in the for-

mer Chapter, *That ſinful error in ſome points of faith, maie ſtand with ſauing faith, true Church, and ſaluation,* The fowlnes wherof doth not ſo euidently appeare, if it be only ſaied, that ſome points of faith, are not fundamental to ſauing faith, to Church, or to ſaluation, though they be ſufficiently propoſed. For in rigor of ſpeech, not euerie neceſſarie parte, is fundamental: as a roof is neceſſarie to a houſe, yet not fundamental. Beſids by *Not fundamental*, they maie ſeeme to meane, *Not principal*, or *Not Capital*. In which ſenſe, it is no fowle doctrin, to ſaie, Some points are *Not Fundamental*, though they be ſufficiently propoſed: as it is to ſaie, ſome are Not neceſſarie though they be ſufficiently propoſed: Becaus not euerie thing neceſſarie, is principal. Partly alſo, that vnder thes ambiguous termes, *Fundamental, Not Fundamental,* they maie flie from one ſenſe of them, to an other, better then they could vnder the proper termes *Neceſſarie, Not Neceſſarie*, and ſo delude their

Not al things Neceſſarie are Fundamental.

Some points propoſed, not principal, and yet neceſſarie.

See c. 16. n. 6.

aduerſarie, and auoid conuiction. For ſometimes by *Fundamental articles*, they only meane principal or capital articles of faith: And by *Not fundamental*, Not principal, or Not capital articles. And thus they muſt meane, when they proue out of Catholiks, that they admit Fundamental and Not fundamental articles. At other times by *Fundamental*, they meane articles ſufficient to a Church, and to ſaluation: And by *Not fundamental articles*, Not at al neceſſarie to a Church or to ſaluation, as we clearly shewed in the ſecond Chapter. And this craft they could not ſo wel vſe, vnder the words *Neceſſarie*, *Not neceſſarie*, Becaus nether are they ſo ambiguous, as *Fundamental*, *Not fundamental*: nether do Catholiks deuide articles into *Neceſſarie*, *Not neceſſarie*, (becaus they account al neceſſarie, ether to be beleued actually, if they be ſufficiently propoſed, or virtually, though they be not ſo propoſed) as ſome doe into *Fundamental*, *Not fundamental*. And that Proteſtants vſe

Al points of faith, twoe waies neceſſarie.

Fundamental in an other ſenſe, then we doe, is euident, by thes words of Chillingworth in his anſwer to the Preface p. 16. *In our ſenſe of the word Fundamental, I hope she* (Ro. Church) *erred not fundamentally: but in your ſenſe of the word, I feare she did.*

2. Whereof to auoid al ambiguitie, equiuocation, or diſpute of words, if *by Fundamental points*, Proteſtants would only meane, principal or capital points of faith; and by *not fundamental*, not principal or not Capital points of faith: or if *by fundamental points*, they would only meane ſuch, as are the fundations of other articles: or laſtly, by *Fundamental Articles*, ſuch as (in ordinarie courſe) their actual beleif is neceſſarie to euerie particular perſon, and to ſaluation, And by *Not fundamental points*, ſuch as their actual beleif is not abſolutly neceſſarie to euerie particular perſon, or to ſaluation, but only cõditionally, if they be ſufficiently propoſed, there would be no difference between vs about this diſtinction of *Fundamental*,

In what sẽſe Fundamental and Not fundamental maie be uſed.

See Bellarm. l. 4. de verbo Dei c. 11. Peron Epiſt. ad Reg. Inc. obſeruat. 3.

D. Potter ſec 7. p. 74. Chillingw. p. 263. 283. 227.

 But (as I ſaid) their defending ſuch Churches, as ſinfully err in ſome points of faith ſufficiētly propoſed, or for their fault, haue them not ſufficiently propoſed, forceth them to vnderſtand *by fundamental points*, ſuch points, as abſolutly or in al caſes ſuffice to ſauing faith, to a Church, and to ſaluation: And by *Not fundamentals*, ſuch as are abſolutly or in al caſes vnneceſſarie to ſauing faith to a Church, or to ſaluation. In which ſenſe we condemn this their diſtinction, as a ground of atheiſme and damnable deceipt of ſuch, as ſinfully err in ſome points of faith: But now let vs ſee, what account, and what vſe they make of this their diſtinction.

Bellar. l.3. de Eccleſ. c. 14. multa ſunt de fide, quæ nō ſunt abſolute neceſſaria ad ſalutem.

In what ſenſe it is ground of atheiſme.

That Proteſtants make great account, and great vſe, of their diſtinction of Fundamental, and Not Fundamental points.

FOVRTH CHAPTER.

1. THat Proteſtants make great account, and great vſe, of their diſtinction of *Fundamental* and *Not fundamental* points, is euident, both by their words and deeds. For Doctor Potter ſec. 7. p. 70. ſaith *This diſtinction is moſt neceſſarie, and hath a ground in reaſon and ſcripture.* And p. 73. he calleth it, a *moſt neceſſarie and moſt vſeful diſtinction.* And p. 75. a *main diſtinction.* K. Iames Epiſt. and Card. Peron. *This diſtinction, the King accounteth of ſuch importance, to diminish the controuerſies in the Church, as he thinketh it the dutie of euerie peacable man, moſt diligently to explicate, teach, and vrge it.* Chillingworth maketh

A moſt neceſſarie, moſt vſeful, and main diſtinction.

the whole third Chapter of his Book to proue, that this diſtinction is *good and pertinent*, and ſaieth: *This diſtinction is imploied by Proteſtants to many purpoſes.* In anſwer to the Preface p. 7. *as it is applied by Proteſtants is very good.* Lord Canterburie in his Relation p. 21. and 24. granteth, that the Greek Church hath a dangerous and greuious error, and yet affimeth her to be a true Church, becaus her error is not Fundamental. The like iudgment he giueth of the Romã Church p. 296. 325. and p. 129. 311. So by this diſtinction they ſaue Churches, that haue dangerous and greuious errors.

Saueth Churches greuiouſly erring.

2. Secondly Proteſtants haue made vſe of this diſtinction euer ſince they began to be deuided in points of faith, as a ſoueraigne remedie to couer their rent. For Zuinglius, when he had forſaken Luther in the point of real preſence, for excuſe therof, in his Apolog. tom. 2. fol. 374. ſayed. *That this matter pertined not to anie foundation of faith*: The ſame ſaied Bucer in

Vſed by Proteſtãts ſince their diſſention.

Hoſpinian parte ſecunda hiſt. fol. 127. and Martyr ib. fol. 244. Caluin Defenſ. 2. contra Weſphal. p 766 Beza contra Weſphal. p. 258 Whitak. controu. 2. q. 5. c. 8. Iuel in his Apologie and generally al Sacramentaries, when ether they currie fauour with Lutherans, and would be held for brethren of them, or excuſe to Catholiks, their diſſentions in points of faith. See Doctor Potter ſec. 3. p. 89. and ſec. 5. p. 18. Lord Canterburie ſec. 38. p. 325.

3. Thirdly, this their diſtinction is the ground of their defenſe in controuerſies of greateſt moment, tō wit, which are true Churches, and in which ſaluatiō maie be had: and with which, men maie communicate lawfully. For, if we proue, that the Proteſtant Church in general (as it comprehendeth both Lutherans and Caluiniſts) is no true Church, nor can afford ſaluation: nor is ſuch, as men may lawfully communicate withal, becaus her members are ſinfully deuided in points of faith and Religion, one

The ground of Proteſtāts defence in main points.

from the other, they answer not, that they are not sinfully deuided, but that their diuision is not in points fundamental, but only in not fundamental points: which diuision doth not hinder that vnitie of faith, or of Church, which is necessarie. Likwise, if we proue, that the Lutherans are no true Church, becaus they are deuided in points of faith from the Caluinists, their answer is, this diuision is not in fundamental points, but only in points not fundamental, which diuision (whether it be sinful, or no) doth not destroie the substance of a true Church. The like answer for the Roman Church, Protestants doe giue, when it pleaseth them to grant, that she is a true Church, and that saluation maie be had in her. Finally, if we proue, that no particular Protestant Church can be a true Church, or haue hope of saluation, becaus (as Protestants confes) euerie one of their Churches erreth in some point of faith, nay that there is no hope, that anie Church shal be free from al

D. Potter sec. 2. p. 38.

L. Canterb sec. 38 p. 325.

error in points of faith, they anſwer: This error is only in not fundamental points, which error deſtroieth not ſauing faith, Church, or meanes of ſaluation, whether it be vincible and ſinful, or no.

4. Thus we ſee, that by meanes of this diſtinction, of *fundamental, and not fundamental* points, Proteſtants doe make Churches to be true, or falſe, as they pleaſe, accordingly, as they make points of faith to be fundamental, or not fundamental, as they pleaſe: nether telling vs conſtantly, which are fundamental, which not fundamental; nor giuing vs anie certaine rule to know which are ſuch, but reſeruing the determination hereof to their ends, as they need: Secondly by meanes of this diſtinction, they endeauour to mainteine three main points, to wit: That ſuch Churches, as they confes to err in ſome points of faith, are notwithſtanding true Churches: That ſaluation may be had in ſuch erring Churches: And that men may lawfully communicate with

what kind of erring Churches maie be true Churches.

erring Churches. Which doctrin of theirs, if it were meant only of ſuch Churches, as inuincibly, vnwittingly or innocently err, or which err in *not fundamental* points, not ſufficiently propoſed, were not to be condemned: but being meant (as it is, and muſt be by them, for manie ſuch Churches as they doe mainteine) of obſtinat or ſinful error, or of error about *Not-fundamental* points ſufficiently propoſed, is abhominable, and indeed the verie ground of atheiſme. Nether, though it were true, would it ſuffice them for to mainteiue ſome Churches, which they mainteine, and ſaluation in thē: both becaus they ſometimes confes, that thoſe Churches do err euen in fundamental points: and alſo, becaus thoſe Churches want Communion in Sacraments, which is as eſſential, to a true Church, as faith is, as we shal shew hereafter. C. 19. So that this their ground of mainteining ſuch erring Churches as they doe mainteine, is not only fals and atheiſtical, but alſo though it were

what kinde of erring Churches Proteſtants meane.

true, were insufficient to vphold such Churches, as they endeauour to vphold by it, as (God willing) I shal shew euidently in this Treatise. But first we wil shew their vncertaintie, both what, and which are *Not-fundamental* points, and whether a true Church can err euen in fundamental points, that therby the Reader may see, that this their ground, is not only fals, and also insufficient for their purpose; but also that they themselues are not certaine, or assured of it; and yet do vpon this ground, venture their saluation in liuing in confessed erring Churches: and other mens also, in teaching them, that it is not necessarie to sauing faith, to a member of the Church, or to saluation, to beleue euerie point of faith though sufficiently proposed, or which would be so proposed, if it were not also the fault of the not beleuer, which is damnably to deceaue poore soules.

Protestants ground, neither true, nor sufficiēt for their purpose.

That Proteſtants are vncertaine, vvhat a Not-fundamental point is.

FIFT CHAPTER.

Difference between what, and which is.

1. THe queſtions: *what is ſuch a thing?* and, *which is ſuch a thing?* are different. For the former, enquireth the nature of the thing, and the latter, which hath that nature: as, *what is a Lion*, enquireth, what is his nature? *which is a Lion*, enquireth, which is the beaſt, that hath that nature? In this Chapter, we wil shew the Proteſtants vncertaintie, what is the nature of *Not fundamental* points, and in the next chapter, their vncertaintie, which are they, that haue the nature of *Not fundamental points*. For, ether becaus indeed, they know not, what is the nature, or cõdition of their *Not-fundamental points*; or becaus, being between twoe ſtreights, to wit,

of defending Churches, which ſinfully err in points not fundamental, and of defending their ſeparation from the Roman Church, for pretended errors in points not fundamental: Or laſtly, becaus they would not haue Catholiks to be able to conuince, what they teach in this matter, they doe ſo perplexedly deliuer their doctrin about not fundamental points, as there is greater difficultie to conuince, what indeed is their doctrin herein, then that it is fals doctrin.

2. Firſt therfore, they teach (as we shewed before in the 2. chapter) that *Not fundamental points*, are *By truths, vnneceſſarie, not neceſſarie, for which no ſeparation ought to be made:* and (as Chillingworth ſaieth c. 4. p. 220.) *By, Fundamental, we meane al, and only that, which is neceſſarie.* So, no point not fundamental, can be neceſſarie.

Not fundamentals are not neceſſarie for ſaluation, or ſeparation.

3. Secondly, they ſaie, that *Not-fundamental* points are opinions, doubtful matters, obſcure points, diſputable in themſelues, and happi-

But opiniõs, doubtful, obſcure, not euidently deduced out of ſcripture.

ly, by plaine Scripture, indeterminable, diſputable opinions, not clearely defined in Scripture, not euidently deducible out of Scripture, of which nether Church nor Councel hath anie infallible aſſurance, and in which, modeſt oppoſition is tolerable. D. Potter ſec. 2. p. 38. ſpeaking of Not-fundamental points ſaieth. *The vnitie of the Church is nothing hindered by dinerſitie of opinions in doubtful matters.* See alſo p. 40. 43. And p, 39. calleth, Not fundamental points, *Probable, Accidental, and Obſcure points, wherein the oppoſitions of learned men, proceeding modeſtly, are tolerable.* Sec. 4. p. 94. *If we did not diſſent in ſome opinions, from the preſent Roman Church, we could not agree with the Church truly Catholik.* Sec. 7. p. 74. ſaieth of Not fundamental points: *They are diſputable in themſelues, and happily, by plaine Scripture, indeterminable.* And ſec. 6. p. 54. affirmeth, that controuerſies among Proteſtants, are only in diſputable opinions, not clearly defined in Scripture. And yet their Controuerſies, are (at

Not fundamentals are opinions.

Oppoſition in not fundamentals, is tolerable.

VVhitak. cont. 2. q. 5. c. 8. our contentions are for faith, for Religiõ.

leaſt) in not fundamental points: Chillingworth in his preface num. 30. *The diſputes of Proteſtants* (about not fundamentals) *are touching ſuch things, as maie with probabilitie be diſputed on both ſides:* and calleth Proteſtants *men of different opinions, touching obſcure controuerſed queſtions of Religion.* Nu. 32. *Thoſe truths, wil be fundamental, which are euidently deliuered in Scripture, and commanded to be preached to al men: Thoſe, not fundamental, which are obſcure-Nothing that is obſcure, can be neceſſaric to be vnderſtood, or not miſtaken.* c. 1. p. 41. *Thos are not fundamental, which are therehence* (out of Scripture) *deducible but probably, not euidently.* And c. 3. p. 129. calleth the points, in which Proteſtants diſſent, *matters not plainely and vndoubtedly deliuered in Scripture.* c. 5. p. 306. *As for our continuing in their* (Churches erring not fundamentaly) *Communion, the iuſtification hereof, is not ſo much, that their errors are not damnable, as that they require not the beleife, and profeſſion of theſe errors, among the conditions of*

Not fundamentals, are obſcure matters.

Not euidently deducible out of Scripture.

their communion. And 307. *It is not lawful to ſeparate from anie Churches Communion, for errors not perteining to the ſubſtance of faith, vnles that Church require the beleif and profeſsion of them.* Lord Canterburie ſec. 21. p. 147. termeth not fundamental points, *Diſputable doctrin*, and *points of curious ſpeculation*: and errors in the ſame, *light*. Sec. 25. p. 165. *Curious truths*. Sec. 38. p. 361. *opinions which flutter about faith*. And ſec. 38. p. 357. he affirmeth, that in not fundamentals, *Nether general Councels, nor the whole Church hath infallible certaintie*. And ibid. p. 358. That in them, *it is no matter, if Councels err*. And ibid. *It it not requiſite, that for them, we ſhould haue an infallible aſſurance*. And ſec. 32. p. 226. *when they know it* (the error) *if the error* (of a general Councel) *be not manifeſtly againſt fundamental veritie, I would haue al wiſe men conſider, whither external obedience be not, euen then, to be yeelded*. So that obedience may be yeelded againſt not fundamental veritie. And ſec. 26. p. 205. *Bihops ſubiect*

No ſeparation for not fundamental errors.

Curious truths.

No infallibilitie in not fundamẽtal points.

External obedience, to known error in not fũdamẽtals.

to Kings in ſpiritual cauſes too, ſo the foundations of faith, and manners be not shaken.

4. Thirdly, they teach, that *not fundamentals points*. are no points of faith. This followeth euidently out of what we euen now related: For if they be but opinions, obſcure, and doubtful matters, wherof we can haue no infallible certaintie, or aſſurance, not clearely defined in ſcripture, nor euidently deducible out of Scripture, they cannot ſaie, they are points of faith, vnles they wil turne faith into opinion, and make that a point of faith, which nether is clearely defined in Scripture, nor euidently deducible out of Scripture: But beſids this, ſometimes they expreſly teach, that *not fundamentals* are no points of faith, or of Religion. Doctor Potter ſec. 2. p. 40. calleth not fundamental points, *Things beſide, or without the faith.* Sec. 5. p. 89. *How Chriſt is in the Symbols, and how in heauen and earth, is no parte of faith.* Sec. 6. p. 54. *Our* (Proteſtant) *Controuerſies are none of them in the*

Not fundamentals no points of faith.

 Proteſtants vncertaitie ſubſtance of faith, but only in diſputable opinions. Lord Canterburie ſec. 39. p. 387. *Superſtructures are doctrins about the faith, not the faith itſelfe, vnles they be immediat conſequences.* And p. 388. *Suppoſe vncertaintie in ſome of thes ſuperſtructures, it can neuer be thence concluded, that there is no infallible certaintie of the faith itſelf.* p. 341. *This Athanaſius Creed, and the Apoſtles, and no more, is the Catholik faith.* Sec. 38. p. 361. he calleth *Not fundamentals, opinions, which flutter about faith.* And p. 376. ſaieth: *Nor do the Church of Rome, and the Proteſtants, ſet vp a different Religion. For the Chriſtian Religion, is the ſame to both.* And yet theſe Churches differ, at leaſt, in not fundament l points, and ſo Not-fundamental points, are no points of Religion. Chillingworth c. 3. p. 129. *But you* (Papiſts) *are al agreed, that only thoſe things, wherin you doe agree, are matters of faith: And Proteſtants, if they were wiſe, would doe ſo too. Sure I am, they haue reaſon enough to doe ſo, ſeing al of them agree with explicit faith in al*

Not fundamētals make not differēce in Religion.

Not matters of faith, in which Proteſtants differ.

thos things, which are plainly and vndoubtedly deliuered in Scripture. Thus Conſubſtantiation, vbiquitie, and ſuch, are not matters of faith. And in anſwer to the preface, when his aduerſarie had ſaied, *That men of different Religions (* as Papiſts and Proteſtants *) maie be ſaued, is a ground of atheiſme,* he wil not admit Papiſts and Proteſtants to be men of different Religions, but ſaieth p. 14. *By men of different Religions, he muſt meane Chriſtians of diuers opinions and communions, or els he ſpeaketh not to the point.* And c. 4. p. 209. *The diuerſitie of opinions, which is among the ſeueral ſects of Chriſtians, ought to be no hinderance to their vnitie in communion.* So that the ſeueral ſects of Chriſtians differ but in opinions, and yet doubtles they differ in not fundamentals. Lord Canterburie alſo ſec. 39. p. 376. Potter ſec. 3. p. 58. White in Defenſ. of his way c. 38. and others ſay, that the Proteſtant and the Roman Religion are the ſame: and yet grant, that they differ in not fundamental points. Whence it muſt

Differēce in not fundamentals ſhould not hinder communion.

Optatus l. 2. vbi vultus, ibi eſt Eccleſia, & non eſt vbi non vultus.

needs follow, that not fundamental points are no points of Religion. For if they be points of Religion, who differ in them, differ in Religion.

Error in not Fundamentals is not hereſie.

5. Fourthly they teach, that no oppoſition to not fundamẽtal points, is true hereſie, as we ſhewed before c. 2. and it followeth out of what euen now we rehearſed. For if *not fundamental* points be no points of faith, oppoſition to them, cannot be hereſie. For hereſie, is an error againſt faith. And as Lord Canterburie ſaieth ſec. 26. p. 198. *Hereſie, properly cannot be, but in doctrin of faith.*

Not fundamentals, are matters of nothing.

6. Laſtly, Proteſtants not content to teach, that *not fundamental* points are but opinions, no points of faith, doubtful matters, and ſuch like, ſometimes ſpeak contemptuouſly of them, as if they were not to be regarded at al: as when we obiect to Caluiniſts, their difference from Lutherans, in ſuch points, as they account not fundamentals: Whitaker controu. 1. q. 4. c. 3. calleth them, *ſmal matters*. K. Iames in his Monitorie Epiſtle: *Things*

Things indifferent, and tittles. D. Andrews Resp. ad Apol Bellarm. c. 14. *Matters of no great moment.* The Apologie of the Church of England, *No great matters.* Caluin Admonit. vltima, p. 832. *Matters of nothing.* Martyr in Locis, Classe 4. c. 10. paragr. 65. *Matters not to be much respected.* Doctor Potter sec. 3. p. 89. *No parte of faith, but curious Nicities.* Thus meanely, nay contemptously, they speak of *Not-fundamētal* points, when they wil maintaine anie Church, which they confes to err in Not-fundamental points, or saluation to be had in such a Church, or their own Communion with her. And surely, If Not-fundamental points, were such, as hitherto they haue described, euident it were, that euen obstinat error in them could not destroie sauing faith, true Church, or hope of saluation, nor hinder Communion with anie Church obstinatly erring in such points.

7. But at other times, Not-fundamental points, are points of faith with them, are weightie matters, as on

At other times not fundamentals are points of faith.

which dependeth mens ſaluation: and errors againſt them, damnable, as we ſhall ſee at large hereafter. And thus highly they eſteeme of Not-fundamentall points, eſpecialy, when they would iuſtifie their ſeparation from the Roman Church, which they confes to be a true Church, and to hold the fundamental points, and yet ſay, her errors are horrible and damnable, and iuſt cauſe of ſeparation from her. But let vs heare them firſt freeing the Roman Church from fundamental errors, and after, condemning her for damnable errors, and ſuch as are iuſt cauſe of ſeparation. Doctor Potter ſec. 3. p. 62. *The moſt neceſſarie and fundamental truthes, which conſtitute a Church, are on both ſides* (Catholik and Proteſtants) *vnqueſtioned.* p. 60. *The things, wherin the Proteſtants do iudge the life and ſubſtance of Religion to be compriſed, their aduerſaries* (Papiſts) *themſelues do auow and receaue them, as wel as they.* And p. 58. *In the prime grounds or principles of Religion, we haue not forſaken the Church of Rome.*

L. 2. c. 1.

Rome holdeth that which conſtitutes a Church.

The life and ſubſtance of Religion.

The fundamental truths.

Chillingworth in Anſwer to the Preface, p. 16. *In our ſenſe of the word, fundamental, I hope she* (Roman Church) *erred not fundamentally.* c. 3. p. 164. *The only and main reaſon, why we beleue you not to err in fundamentals, is your holding the doctrins of faith in Chriſt, and repentance.* c. 7. p. 401. *we approue thoſe fundamental and ſimply neceſſarie truths, which you reteine, by which ſome good ſoules among you maie be ſaued.* p. 404. *We hope she reteines thoſe truths, which are ſimply, abſolutly, and indiſpenſably neceſſarie to ſaluation, which may ſuffice to bring thoſe good ſoules to heauen.* Lord Canterburie ſec. 35. p. 299. *Romaniſts, as they are Chriſtians that is, as they beleue the Creed, and hold the foundation, Chriſt himſelf, I dare not proceed ſo roughly, as the denie, or weaken the foundation, which is Chriſt, euen among them, and which is and remaineth holie, euen in the midſt of their ſuperſtitions.* And ſec. 39 p. 376. *The Proteſtant, and the Roman Religion, is the ſame.* And the ſame it could not be, if the Roman differed in fundamental points. And

Erreth not in fundamentals.

See alſo c. 3. p. 163.

Holdeth what is neceſſarie to ſaluation.

Holdeth the foundation.

ſec. 35. p. 285. and ſec. 36. p. 314. 315. affirmeth, that ignorant ſoules in the Roman Church, *are ſafe*, and that their ſimplicitie of beleuing, maketh them ſafe, yea ſafeſt. And ſec. 26. p. 192. *Proteſtants haue not leaft the Church of Rome in her eſſence, not in the things which conſtitute a Church.* Thus theſe men plainly confes, that the errors of the Roman Church, are not fundamental, but only not fundamental. More confeſſions of Proteſtants, that the Roman Church holdeth al the fundamental points, maie be ſeene lib. 1. of the Author of Proteſtancie c. 2. paragr. 3.

Ignorants in the Roman Church, are ſafe.

8. And neuertheles, thes ſame men ſaie, her errors are horrible and damnable, and iuſt cauſe of ſeparation. Doctor Potter ſec. 3. p. 62. *The Roman Church is extreamly defiled with horrible errors and corruptions.* Chillingworth in Anſwer to the Preface p. 16. *Errors of the Roman Church, of themſelues, damnable.* c. 1. p. 34. *Poperie in itſelf deſtroies ſaluation.* Lord Canterburie ſec. 35. p. 296. *He that*

Yet holdeth Rome horrible errors.

Errors of themſelues damnable.

beleues, as that (Roman) *Church beleues, is guiltie of the Sciſme, which that Church firſt cauſed by her corruptions, and of al her damnable opinions too.* And p. 298. *And therfore in this preſent caſe, there is peril, great peril, of damnable, both Schiſme, and Hereſie, and other ſin, by liuing and dying in the Roman faith, tainted with ſo manie ſuperſtitions, as this daie it is.* Chillingworth c. 5. p. 276. *Your corruptions in them ſelues may induce on obligation to forſake your communion.* And they al three though they confeſſed, that the errors of the Roman Church are not fundamental, yet afford ſaluation to theſe only of the Roman Church, who ether are inuincibly ignorant of her errors, or repent themſelues of them, as is to be ſeene in Doctor Potter ſec. 3. p. 76. Chillingworth c. 5. p. 267. 285. 283. c. 7. p. 398. Lord Canterburie ſec. 34. and 35. So not fundamental errors, which before they ſo much ſleighted, ſometimes are horrible errors, damnable opinions, of themſelues damnable, and deſtructiue of ſaluation,

Guiltie of ſchiſme.

Damnable opinions.

Peril of Schiſme.

and iuſt cauſe of ſeparation.

9. Finally their ignorance, and vncertaintie, what Fundamental, or Not Fundamental points are, appeareth by their manifold, and ambiguous diſtinctions of them. Their firſt diſtinction is, of Fundamental properly and improperly. Doctor Potter ſect. 7. p. 75. *Fundamental properly is that, which Chriſtians are oblidged to beleue by an expres and actual faith.* Lord Canterb. ſec. 10. p. 38. *Catholik Maximes are properly Fundamental.* An other diſtinction is, Formally not Formally. L. Canterb. ſect, 38. p. 334. *Deductions are not formally fundamental for al men.* An other is, In ſome ſenſe. Potter ſect. 7. p. 74. *whatſoeuer is reuealed in Scripture, is in ſome ſenſe Fundamental.* An other, Abſolutly, not Abſolutly. L. Cannterb. ſect. 18. p. 139. *The Church cannot err in abſolute Fundamentals.* p. 140. *The Church cannot err in doctrins abſolutly Fundamētal.* ſect. 25. p. 162. *The Church cannot err in abſolute Fundamentals.* P. 165. *In abſolute foundations.* Chillingworth c. 5.

Properly

Formally.

In ſome ſenſe.

Abſolutly.

p. 282. *We hope your errors, are not absolutly vnpardonable.* An other distinction is, Simply Fundamental, not Simply. L. Canterb. sect. 9. p. 24. *It was a question, not simply Fundamental.* sect. 10. p. 31. *Nothing is simply Fundamental, becaus the Church declares it.* sect. 25. p. 162. *Prouided, it be not in anie point simply Fundamental.* Potter in Chillingworth p. 7. *Simply and indispensably necessarie, Precisely necessarie.* *Simply.*

An other is, Prime foundations, and not Prime. L. Canterb sect. 33 p. 256. 258. *The Church is infallible in the Prime foundations of faith.* An other is: To some, and not to al. L. Canterb. sec. 10. p. 37. *What perteines to Christian faith, is not by and by fundamental in the faith to al men.* Chillingworth c. 3 p. 184. *That maie be fundamental to one, which to an other is not so.* Potter sec. 7 p. 103. *Some truth is fundamental in some persons in certaine respects, which is not to some others.* *Prime.*

An other distinction, is That some are fundamental Remedielesly, others not Chillingworth c. 5. p. 290. *Fundamental errors, maie* *Remedielesly*

 Protcſtants vncertaine ſignifie, ether ſuch, as are repugnant to Gods commaund, but pardonable by ignorance, or which are Remedieleſly pernitious, and deſtructiue of ſaluation. An other. *Some are ether in themſelues, or by accident fundamental.* Chillingworth c. 1. p. 41. An other is, ſome are Reductiue Fundamental, others not, ſo White in L. Canterb. ſect 37. p. 317. *Popish errors, are Fundamental Reductiue.* p. 321. *Some errors of that Church, were fundamental Reductiue.* But what ſignifieth this multiplicitie of ambiguous diſtinctions, but, their ignorance or vncertainetie, what is truly Fundamental, and their minde to delude their Aduerſarie, and to confound their Reader. Wheras one diſtinction, Truly, Not truly, would haue ſufficed. For Fundamental is of one only Nature, and what hath that nature, is truly Fundamẽtal, what hath it not, is not truly Fundamental, and this multiplicitie of Fundamentals, diſcouereth clearely ignorance, and vncertainetie, what is the true Nature or Eſſence of Fundamental. And

Reductiuely

thus we haue ſeene, how vncertaine Proteſtants are, What Not-fundamentals points be, to wit, Whether points of faith, or but opinions. Whether errors in them be damnable or no: Whether ſeparation ought to be made for them, or no: Whether they make difference in Religion, or no: And whether the Nature of fundamental, be one or manifold. Now let vs ſee, how vncertaine alſo they be, which are Fundamental points, Which, Not-fundamental.

THAT PROTESTANTS are vncertaine, vvhich are Fundamental, and vvhich Not-fundamental.

SIXT CHAPTER.

1. IN the former Chapter I shewed, how vncertaine Proteſtants are, what a *Not-fundamental point is*, but now ſaie one thing, now the contrarie, as it ſerueth for their preſent purpoſe, ether to iuſtifie a Church that ſinfully erreth in Not fundamentals, For then they are no points of faith, but diſputable opinions, light matters, for which no ſeparation ought to be made: or to iuſtifie their ſeparation from a Church, which they confes erreth but in Not-fundamentals. For then they are matters of faith, and errors in them, horrible, and of themſelues damnable, and iuſt cauſe of ſeparation, or ſchiſme. Now I wil

shew their like vncertaintie, which are the points, that are Fundamental, and which, Not-fundamental: and that as it ſerueth to their preſent purpoſe, ether to iuſtifie a Church, or to condem a Church, they make the ſelf ſame points to be Fundamental, or Not fundamental.

2. And as for their vncertaintie, or ignorance, which are al the Fundamental points, themſelues profes it. For thus Chillingworth c. 3. p. 166. *we know not preciſely, iuſt how much is fundamental.* p. 134. *It is impoſſible to ſet down an exact Catalogue of Fundamentals.* Which he repeateth p. 135. and c. 4. p. 201. c. 6. p 367. and in Anſwer to the Preface p. 26. And c. 7. p. 408. *Proteſtants do not agree touching what points are fundamental.* Lord Canterb. ſec. 38. p. 325 *To ſet bounds to this, and ſtrictly to define it for particular men, Iuſt thus far you muſt beleue in euerie particular, or incur damnation, is no work for my pen.* And ibid. 372. *The Church cannot teach, iuſt how far euerie man muſt beleue, as it relates to the poſsibilitie, or*

Impoſſible for Proteſtants to giue an exact catalogue of Fundamentals.

impossibilitie of his saluation in euerie particular. And if it be impossible for them to set down an exact Catalogue of fundamentals, it is impossible for them to tel exactly, which are Fundamentals, and which Not-fundamentals.

3. But at other times, they vndertake to giue vs an exact Catalogue of fundamētals. For thus Chillingworth c. 4. p. 193. *Concerning the Creeds conteining the Fundamētals of Christianitie, This is Doctor Potters assertiō. The Creed of Apostles, as it is explained in latter Creeds of the Catholik Church, is esteemed a sufficient Summarie, or Catalogue of Fundamentals, by the best learned Romanists, and by Antiquitie.* The like he hath p. 413 Behold, a sufficient Catalogue of Fundamentals. And ibid p. 206. *The Apostles Creed, is a perfect Summarie of the Fundamentals of the Christian faith.* c. 1. p. 41 *The Creed, is a sufficient, or more then a sufficient, Summarie of thos points of faith, which were of necessitie to be beleued actually and explicitly.* And thes are his Fun-

The Creed as it is explained, is a sufficiēt Catalogue of Fundamentals.

The Creed is a sufficient Summarie of Fundamentals.

damentals. And c. 3. p. 133. *This is the, minimum quod ſic. wherin, in men capable of faith, God wil be pleaſed*: and he that knoweth *minimum quod ſic*, and the loweſt degree of faith, doth he not know *Maximum quod ſic*, and the higheſt degree? And ibid. p. 150. *They maie learn from the Scripture, that ſuch points are fundamental, others are not ſo.* And if they can learn from the Scripture, that ſuch points are fundamental, others are not, why can they not gather out of Scripture a Catalogue of Fundamentals? C. 7. p. 408. *You ouerreach in ſaying, Proteſtants cannot agree touching what points are fundamental.* Doctor Potter ſect. 7 p. 78. *Thoſe prime and Capital doctrines of our Religion, which make vp the Catholik and Apoſtolik faith, that faith, which eſſentialy conſtitutes a true Church, and a true Chriſtian. Thes fundamentals are al conteined in the rule of faith, which rule hath been ſummed vp and contracted into the Apoſtles Creed, and hath been receaued by Orthodox Chriſtians of al Ages and places, as an abſolute Summarie of the*

Out of Scripture we maie learne which are Fundamentals, which not.

The Apoſtles creed is a catalogue of Fundamentals.

Chriſtian faith. And after he had proued this, ſaith p. 94. *Now our Miſtaker hath his Catalogue of fundamentals.* Behold againe a Catalogue of fundamentals. Sect. 3. p. 60. *The things, wherin Proteſtants doe iudge the life and ſubſtance of Religion to be compriſed, are ſummarily deliuered in the Symbols, or Creeds.* And what are thoſe, in which the life and ſubſtance of Religion is compriſed, but Fundamentals? And ibid. p. 61. *To thoſe twelue* (Articles) *which the Apoſtles in their Creed eſteemed a ſufficient Summarie of holſome doctrin, they* (Papiſts) *haue added manie more.* And what difference is there betwixt a Summarie, and a Catalogue?

Feild l. 3. c. 4. nameth which they account fundamentals.

The Creed is a ſufficient Summarie of fundamentals.

4. Lord Canterburie ſec. 38. p. 371. *The foundation, is ſufficiently known by Scripture, and the Creeds.* And if it be ſufficiently known, why cannot Proteſtants giue vs an exact Catalogue of Fundamentals? Sect. 37. p. 319. *If he meane, different in the foundation itſelf, the Creed, then, &c.* Lo here the Creed is the foundation. Sec. 38. cit. p. 334. *The Proteſtants haue as infallible*

assurance, as you can haue, of al points, which they account fundamental, yea and of al, which were so accounted by the Primitiue Church: and these are but the Creed, and some few and those immediate deductions from it. Lo Potestants know al points, which they account fundamental, and why then can they not giue an exact Catalogue of them? Sec. 10. p. 28. *The Creed is a common, is a constant foundation: Deductions from it, cannot be fundamental.* The English Deputies in the Synod of Dort, sess. 15. *The fundamental heads of Religion, are conteined in the Creed, the Lords praier, Decalogue, and the Sacraments.* Behold (Christian Reader) how these men, sometimes cannot giue an exact Catalogue of fundamentals, sometime they can. Sometimes al the fundamentals, are conteined in the Apostles Creed, sometimes in the Apostles Creed, and in some few and immediat deductions from it: At other times, deductions from the Creed cannot be fundamental. Sometimes al fundamentals are comprised in the

The Creed, and some deductions from it.

Deductions cannot be fundamentals.

Symbols and Creeds; and at other times, al the fundamentals are conteined in the Creed, the Lords praier, Decalogue, and Sacraments. Who wil ſee more of the Proteſtants vncertaintie, which articles are to be accounted fundamental, maie read lib. 1. of the Author of Proteſtancie c. 3. num. 1. and 2.

5. In like manner, they are vncertaine, whether the pretended truthes, againſt which they ſaie the Roman Church erreth, be fundamental, or no. For (as we ſaw in the former Chapter, nu. 7.) ſometimes they ſaie, she holdeth the foundation, the fundamental truths, erreth not in fundamentals, and holdeth al that is abſolutly neceſſarie to ſaluation: And the ſame followeth euidently out of that, they grant the Roman Church to be a true Church in eſſence, and ſaie, that she and the Proteſtant Church, and their Religions, be al one in ſubſtance For nether could she be a true Church in eſſence, if she erred in anie fundamental point; nether can thes Churches,

The errors which Rome holds are not fundamental.

See their words infra c. 7. n 3. 4. and c. 2. n. 3.

Churches, or Religions, be al one in ſubſtance, which differ in fundamental points But at other times, they auow, that the errors of the Roman Church, are fundamental, and in themſelues damnable, and conſequently oppoſit to ſome fundamental points of faith. For thus Whitaker controu. 2. q. 6. c. 3. *The Roman Church hath taken away manie fundamental Articles of faith, and corrupted faith in the principal points.* Chillingworth c. 5. p. 263. *where doth he* (D. Potter) *ſaie, that you had for the ſubſtance, the true preaching of the word, or due adminiſtration of the Sacraments, or where does he ſaie, you wanted nothing fundamental, or neceſſarie to ſaluation?* Ibid p. 280. *As for your pretence, that yours* (errors) *are confeſſed not to be fundamental, it is an affected miſtake, as I haue often told you.* p. 289. *Your Church did fal into ſubſtantial corruptions.* And p. 305. *A falshood it is, that the Doctor iudges the Roman errors, not to be in themſelues fundamental or damnable.* p. 308. *As for your obtruding vpon vs, that we beleue the*

Errors of Rome fundamental and damnable.

Rom. errors in thẽſelues fundamental.

 Proteſtants vncertaine points of difference, not fundamental, or neceſſarie, you haue beene often told, that it is a calumnie. And c. 7. p. 387. *Falſe pretence, that we confes, the Roman Church free from damnable hereſie, and yeelding you ſaluation, no Proteſtant is guiltie of it.* And p. 34. 282. 278. 293. and 400. ſaieth. *The errors of the Rom. Church are in themſelues damnable.* And c. 5. p. 256. 283. *She is guiltie of impietie and idolatrie, which* (he ſaieth) *is without queſtion, to err in neceſſarie matters.* In like ſort Lord Canterburie ſec. 33. p. 275. al. 257. *Tranſubſtantiation, taken properly, cannot ſtand with the grounds of Chriſtian Religion.* Sec. 37. p. 320. *The Church of Rome, hath in the expoſitions, both of Creeds and Councels, quite changed and loſt the ſenſe and meaning of ſome of them.* And yet ibid. p. 319. ſaieth: *The Creed is the foundation.* Item p. 321. *It is almoſt apparent by D. Whites anſwer ſet down before at large; That he neuer ſaied, that the Church of Rome erred only in points Not-fundamental.* Sec. 38. p. 325. *You haue manie dangerous errors about the verie foun-*

Are damnable hereſies.

Poperie in it ſelf deſtroies ſaluation.

dation, in that which you cal the Roman faith. And p. 327. *The Roman Church at this day, doth not beleue the Scripture, and Creeds, in the ſenſe, in which the ancient Primitiue Church receaued them.* And addeth (as before) *the Creed is the foundation.* Thus vncertaine thes men be, whether the pretended errors of the Roman Church, be fundamental, or no. But ſometimes they are, ſometimes they are not, as it ſerueth for their preſent purpoſe.

9. Perhaps ſome, to ſaue thes contradictions of Proteſtants, that the Roman Church holds al the fundamentals, and holds them not al, hath fundamental errors, and hath not: wil ſaie, that fundamental points are of two kinds. Some are fundamental not only by reaſon of their reuelation from God, and their ſufficient propoſal to vs, but alſo of their owne nature, fundamental or neceſſarie to ſauing faith, Church, and ſaluation, as the paſſion of Chriſt, and ſuch like capital articles: others, not of their owne nature, but merely becauſe they are

see Chillingw. c. 5. p. 209. 291. 336. Potter ſec. 7. p. 71.

reuealed from God, and ſufficiently propoſed to vs, are fundamental to faith, Church, and ſaluation, as that Saint Paul had a cloack &c. And that when Proteſtants confes, that the Roman Church holdeth al the fundamentals, or erreth not in fundamentals, they meane of fundamentals of the firſt kinde; when they ſaie she erreth in fundamentals, they meane of the latter kinde, and ſo do not contradict themſelues, becaus they do not affirme and denie the ſame kinde of fundamentals. True it is, that there is this difference betweene points of faith, that ſome are fundamental to ſauing faith, to a true Church, and to ſaluation, both of their nature, and by reuelation ſufficiently propoſed to vs, as the myſteries of the Trinitie, the paſſion of Chriſt, and ſuch like: others are fundamental or neceſſarie to ſauing faith, Church, and ſaluation, only by reaſon of Gods reuelation ſufficiently propoſed, as that Abraham had two Sonns, and ſuch like. But this wil

not ſuffice, to ſaue the aforeſaied Proteſtants from plaine cõtradiction: becaus, (if not in wonds) in effect and ſenſe, they both affirme and denie that the Roman Church holdeth, and holdeth not, al points of faith that are fundamental of their nature. For whiles they ſaie, that she is a true Church in eſſence, a member of the Catholik Church and of Chriſt, that she holds the fundamental points which conſtitute a Church, which are the life and ſubſtance of Religion, the ſimply neceſſarie truths, by which ſome are ſaued, and that her ſubſtance and Religion is the ſame with the Proteſtants, they muſt needs meane, that she holdeth al the points, which of their nature are fundamental to ſauing faith, Church, and ſaluation: and contrariwiſe, whiles they ſaie, that the Roman Church holdeth errors of themſelues fundamental, hath corrupted faith in the principal points, hath not the ſubſtance of preaching the word, is fallen into ſubſtantial corruptions, holdeth that, which can-

not ſtand with the grounds of Chriſtianitie, hath quite loſt the ſenſe and meaning of ſome articles of the Creed, is guiltie of impietie, and idolatrie, and ſciſme; they muſt needs meane, that she holdeth not al points, which of their nature are fundamental to ſauing faith, Chriſtian Church, and ſaluation. Nether finally, doth this differēce between points of faith, iuſtifie theſe Churches, which they cannot denie, but ſinfully err in ſuch points, as they terme Not-fundamental points, For whenceſoeuer a point be fundamental to faith, Church, and ſaluation, whether of its nature, and reuelation too, or of reuelation only, they cannot ſtand without that, which is fundamental to them, as is euident by itſelef, and Proteſtants confes it, as we shal ſee beneath c. 7. n. 5. Beſids, themſelues profes c. 7. n. 6. that by Fundamental they meane Eſſential, and vndoubted it is, that nothing can be without that, which is eſſential to it.

7. And as vncertaine Sacramentaries are, whether the errors of Lu-

therans, be fundamental, or no. For ſometimes they are not fundamental, nay light matters, and not to be regarded, as we shewed before c. 5. n. 5. And Chillingworth in his Preface nu. 39. ſaieth: *I hold the doctrin of al Proteſtants free from al impietie, and from al error deſtructiue of ſaluation, or in it ſelf damnable.* c. 5. p. 306. *we iudge, they* (Proteſtants) *haue no errors damnable.*

No error of Proteſtants, is in it ſelf damnable.

8. But at other times, the Luherans error of Conſubſtantiation, or real preſence of Chriſts Bodie in the Euchariſt, is fundamental. For Caluin Admonit. vltima ad Weſphal. p. 831. ſaieth: *It neceſſarily draweth with it impious Idololatrie.* In conſenſu &c. p. 754. *It is no les abſurd, then Tranſubſtantion.* And Epiſtle 292. *with pernicious iuglings, it ouerthroweth the foundations of faith.* And Epiſtle 81. *It recalleth the dotages of Martion and Eutiches:* Sadeel de coniunctone, &c. *It deſtroieth the nature of Chriſt.* Pareus in Galat. 3. ſec. 37. *Nothing can be more oppoſit to the articles of Chriſtian*

Lutherans errors are fundamental.

faith. And the like ſaie commonly al Sacramentaires or Caluiniſts of the Lutherans vbiquitie, as is to be ſeene l. 1. of the Author of Proteſtancie, c. 3. nu. 5.

9. Thus wee ſee, how vncertaine Proteſtans are, which are their fundamental points of faith, which (as they ſpeak) *comprehend the ſubſtance of Religion, integrate and make vp the bodie of Chriſtian Religion, eſſentially conſtitute a true Church*, and *in ordinarie courſe are neceſſarie to be diſtinctly and expreſly beleued of euerie one that wil be in the Church and be ſaued.* And which are their Not fundamentals, which are not of the ſubſtance of Chriſtian Religion, Church, or ſaluation. And which are fundamental errors, which deſtroie the ſubſtance of ſauing faith, of a true Church, and of the waie of ſaluation: and which are not fundamental errors, which only deſtroie ſome perfection of ſauing faith, of a Church, or of the waie of ſaluation. And conſequently, they muſt be vncertaine, which is ſubſtantially a

D. Potter ſec. 3 p 60. ſec. 7. p. 74. 78. Chilling. c. 3 p 159. L Cant. ſec. 26. p. 192.

ſauing faith, or a true Church, which is not, which is a ſubſtantial waie of ſaluation, which is not; and whether they haue a ſubſtantial ſauing faith, be in a ſubſtantial true Church, and ſubſtantial waie of ſaluation, or no: And alſo vncertaine, with what Church, they maie lawfully communicate; Then the which, nothing can be more miſerable. For as Doctor Potter ſaieth ſec. 5. p. 18. *A true Church, is al one, with a Church not erring in the foundation.* And ſec. 7. p. 74. *By fundamental doctrins, we meane ſuch Catholik veritics, as eſſentially perteine to the faith, ſuch as properly conſtitute a Church.* And as Whitaker controuer 2. q. 5. c. 17. Morton Apologiæ, l. 2. c. 41. and Proteſtants commonly teach: *Puritie in fundamental points, is the only certaine Note of a true Church.* And how can they be certaine, which is a true Church, which is not, if they be not certaine, which is fundamental, which is not, &c. how can they be certaine, which is puritie in fundamētals, which is not, if they be not certaine, which

are fundamentals, which not? Beſids, al fundamental points, as Doctor Potter affirmeth ſec. 7. p. 74. 75. *are neceſſarie in ordinarie courſe to be diſtinctly beleued by euerie Chriſtian, that will be ſaued.* And *Fundamental properly, is that, which Chriſtians are obliged to beleue by an expres, and actual faict.* And the ſame hath Chillingworth p. 41. 193. 227. 209. and Lord Canterb. p. 28. And how then can they be certaine, that they are in the way of ſaluation, and expreſly beleue al they are abliged to beleue, if they doe not diſtinctly and expreſly beleue al fundamentals, or how can they be ſure they doe this, if they doe not diſtinctly and expreſly know al fundamentals?

Al fundamental points muſt be diſtinctly and expreſly beleued.

See Field l. 4. c. 12.

10. If anie Proteſtant anſwer, that though they be not certaine preciſely, which be fundamental articles, which not, yet they are certaine, that the Creed conteineth al fundamental articles, which conſtitute a Church, and which in ordinarie courſe are neceſſarie to be actually beleued: and this

is ſufficient to be certaine of: I replie, Firſt, that at leaſt they cannot be infallibly certaine, that the Creed conteineth al ſuch fundamentals, becaus the Scripture (which they wil haue to teach al things, whereof we can be infallibly certaine) ſpeaketh not at al of the Creed, and conſequently they cannot be infallibly certaine, what Church, or perſons, beleue al, that is fundamental and neceſſarie to be actualy beleued of euerie one, or who is in the waie of ſaluation, or with whom they maie lawfully communicate. I ad alſo, that themſelues profes, that it is, but only probable, that the Creed conteineth al fundamental articles. For thus Doctor Potter ſec. 7. p. 102. *It remaines verie probable, that the Creed is the perfect Summarie of thos fundamental truths, which al Chriſtians ordinarily are bound expreſly to beleue.* Chillingworth p. 200. *That the Creed doth not containe al main and principal points of faith of al ſortes, whither they be ſpeculatiue, or practical, Doctor Potter grants,* So that in beleuing the Creed,

So Chilling. c. 4. p. 194.

Probable onely that the Creed conteineth al fundamentals.

we beleue not al fundamental points. Lord Canterburie sec. 33. p. 334. saieth. The fundamental points, *are the Creed, and some deductions from it.* Others ad other things, as is to be seene l. 1. de Authore Protestant c. 3. Secondly, they cannot saie, that the Creed conteineth al that is fundamental and necessarie to be beleued of euerie one. For iustification by only special faith, which is the most fundamental point of Protestancie, and the life, and soule therof, (as Protestants cal it) is nether actualy in the Creed, nor can be clearly deduced out of it. For to saie, that iustification by only special faith, is conteined in that article of the Creed; (*Remission of sinns*) is absurd. Becaus that article speaketh only of the end, which is remission of sinns, not of the meanes to atteine vnto it, which Protestants wil haue to be only special faith, of which the Creed speaketh not. And in the same manner, is Chillingworth refuted, when he saieth c. 3. p. 135. and 166. *we are sure, that al that is necessarie and*

See li. 11 de authore c. 6 throughout.

One thing is the end, an other the meane ther-to.

waie, is in Scripture, and therfore beleuing al that is there, we are ſure to beleue al that is neceſſarie. And c. 6. p. 367. *beleuing al the Bible, we beleue al that is fundamental.* For, beſids that their foreſaied moſt fundamental point of iuſtification by only ſpecial faith, is not in Scripture, but the quite contrarie, *fundamental points*, (as D. Potter ſaieth ſec. 7. p. 74. *are neceſſarie in ordinarie courſe to be diſtinctly beleued by euerie Chriſtian, that wil be ſaued.* And p. 75. *Fundamenial properly, is that, which Chriſtians are obliged to beleue by an expres and actual faith*, And the ſame doth Chillingworth ſaie p. 41. 193. 227. 209. and others, alſo who make the beleif of Fundamentals neceſſarie, *Neceſſitate Medij.* But who doe only in general beleue al the Bible, do not diſtinctly and expreſly beleue al the fundamentals. And thus we haue shewed, how vncertaine Proteſtants are, both, what *Not fundamental points* be, to wit, whether they be points of faith, or but opinions: and whether errors in them ſufficiētly

To beleue the Bible is not to beleue diſtinctly al fundamentals.

L. Cant. p. 28.

Chillingw. c. 6. p. 336. Vſher Serm. befor K. Iames.

The manifold vncertainties of Proteſtants about not fundamentals.

propoſed, be damnable, or no: and whether they be a iuſt cauſe of ſeparation from a Church, or no: and alſo, how vncertaine they are, whether they know which points be Fundamental, which not fuudamental: and whether the truths, againſt which the Roman Church is pretended to err, be fundamental truths, or no, and her errors, fundamental, or no: And likewiſe whether the errors of the Lutherans be fundamental, or not fundamental: Now let vs ſee, how vncertaine alſo they are, whether a true Church, remaining a true Church, may err in fundamental points, or no.

That Proteſtants are vncertaine, vvhether a true Church can err in fundamental points, or no.

SEAVENTH CHAPTER.

1. THAT Proteſtants are vncertaine, whether a true Church of Chriſt, can err in fundamental points, and yet remaine a true Church, or no, is euident. For ſometimes they plainly affirme it, other times, as plainly denie it.

4. They affirme it: For thus Whitaker cuntrouer. 2. qu. 5. c. 17. *Out of which we gather, that the Church maie for a time err euen, in ſome foundations, and yet be ſafe.* qu. 4. c. 3. *It is euident, that the true Church maie err for a time, euen in things neceſſarie.* Beza l. de Notis Eccleſiæ p. 45. *Some errors, euen in ſome fundamental heads of faith, maie creep into the Catholik Church.* Perkins in Explicat. Symboli colum. 790.

The Church maie err in ſome foundations.

In fundamental heads.

May diametrally oppoſe the foundation

whiles, ether directly or diametrally, or by neceſsitie of conſequence, an error oppoſeth the foundation, if the error be of infirmitie, the Errant is to be reputed a member of the vniuerſal Church. And in Galat. c. 1. v. 2. *If anie err of frailtie, though the error be about the foundation, neuertheles the Church remaineth: as is euident by the example of the Galathians.* In Epiſt. Iudæ v. 19. *The Church of Galatia, by infirmitie was turned to an other Ghoſpel, and erred fundamentally, yet Paul wrote to her, as to a Church of God.* And Tractat. de Baptiſ. colum. 819. *The Apoſtle called the Galathians, the children of God, euen when they erred in the foundation, and had turned to an other Ghoſpel, ſaying; All ye are the ſonns of God. Hence it is, that not euerie enormious ſin, or euerie error againſt the foundation, doth obſcure, and much les extinguish, grace, and regeneration, which maketh ſonns of God.* Sadeel Reſponſ. ad Theſes Poſnan. c. 12. *The Galathians, and Corinthians* (who denied the Reſurrection) *though depraued with error, and diſſenting about a principal*

Couel art. 11.

May be turned to an other Ghoſpel.

Maie denie the Reſurrection.

principal foundation of faith, nor about the manner, but about the thing itſelfe: neuertheles retained the name of a true Church. And the ſame of the Galathians and Corinthians, commonly teach Proteſtants, as confeſſio Heluet. c. 17. Luther in 1. Gal. fol. 215. Caluin 4. Inſtit. c. 1. paragr. 14. and 27. Beza 2. parte Reſponſ. ad acta Colloq. Montis: p. 253. pareus in Gal. 1. lect. 7. Riuet. tractatu 1. ſec. 39. Feild of the Church l. 1. c. 8.

3. Lord Canterburie ſec. 21. p. 141. *If she* (the whole militant Church of Chriſt) *err in the foundation, that is, in ſome one or more fundamental points of faith, then she maie be a Church of Chriſt ſtil.* Sec. 33. p. 233. *A Church maie err, and dangerouſly too.* Sec. 37. p. 320. *A Church maie hold the fundamental point literaly, and yet err groſly, dangerouſly, nay damnably in the expoſition of it.* And ſec. 9. p. 24. *The Greek error of denying the proceſſion of the holie Ghoſt, is a greuious error in diuinitie.* And ſec. 24. p. 154. *what article of faith, doth more concerne Chriſtians in general, then that*

The whole Church maie err in the foundation.

 And neuertheles he ſaieth p. 22. 24. *The Greeks, are a true Church*: Likewiſe he affirmeth, that the Roman Church hath fundamental errors, as we shewed in the former chapter n. 5. and notwithſtanding writeth. Sec. 20. p. 128. 129. *The Roman Church is a true Church, and truth cannot denie it: A true Church in eſſence.* Sec. 35. p. 311. *She is a member of the Catholik Church.* And p. 282. 285. *Saluation maie be had in her.* P. 285. 314. 316. *Ignorant ſoules in her, are ſafe, yea ſafeſt.*

Ignorãts in the Roman Church, are ſafe.

4. D. Potter ſec. 5. p. 21. *The faith of the Church cannot be totally corrupted in the eſſentials of it, or abolished, yet maie it be fowly infected.* Which inſinuateth, that it can be partly corrupted in the eſſentials, and fowly infected in ſome of them. And p. 20. *The Church maie err, and dangerouſly too.* And (as we shewed in former Chapter n. 5.) he affirmeth, that the Roman Church erreth in the foundation; and neuertheles ſaieth ſec. 1. p. 11. *we yeeld her a member of the Catholik*

Faith of the Churc. maie be partly corrupted in the eſſentials.

Church. Sec. 3. p. 74. 75. *we acknowledg her a member of the bodie of Christ, and this cleares vs from the imputation of schisme, whose propertie it is, to cut of from the bodie of Christ and hope of saluation, the Church from which it separates.* p. 58. *Protestants reformation did not change the substance of Religion.* Ibid. *The vital partes kept out the poison.* p. 62. *Protestants yeeld them the name and substance of a Christian Church.* And p. 78. *we beleue their Religion a safe waie to some, such as beleue as they profes.* And p 81. *we were neuer disioined from her in thos main essential truthes, which giue the name and essence of a Church.* Chillingworth also (as is before shewed c. 6. n. 5.) auoucheth, that the Roman Church wanteth fomething fundamental to saluation, is fallen into substantial corruptions: and c. 5. p. 256. 283. *Is guiltie of Idolatrie, and impietie:* And neuertheles c. 2. p. 85. *She is a parte of the Catholik Church.* p. 88. *Is a parte of the presint Church.* c 7. p. 401. *Not cut from the bodie of Christ.* c. 5. p. 284. *A member of the bodie of Christ.*

Propertie of schismatiks

A true Chu. maie fal into substantial corruptions.

Thus plainly doe they ſometimes teach, that a true Church in ſubſtance and eſſence, a parte of the Catholik Church, a member of Chriſt, can err in fundamental points, namely *in impietie, idolatrie, turning to an other Ghoſpel, and denial of the Reſurrection of the Dead.* And the ſame muſt al other Proteſtants ſaie, who teach, that the doctrin and worship commonly profeſſed and practized in the Roman Church, is idolatrous and antichriſtian, and yet ſaie that ignorant Papiſts are in the Church and may be ſaued. And thus they teach, when they wil mainteine ſome Church, which they confes to err in ſome fundamental points, as the Caluiniſts affirme that the Lutherans doe. For as Luther lib. de Captiu. fol. 64. Zuinglius lib. de Relig. c. de Euchar. Melanćthon in Hoſpin. parte 2. fol. 90. and others confes, they accommodate their doctrins to times, and occaſions.

Sie Morton Appeale l 4. c.1. ſect.5.

Proteſtants accõmodate their doctrin to times.

5. But at other times, they teach, that a true Church, remaining a true Church, can not err in anie fundamen.

The Church cannot err in anie fundamental point.

tal point. Whitaker controu. 2. q. 5. c. 17. *If anie fundamental point be taken awaie, the Church presently falleth.* And c. 18. *If anie fundamental principle of faith be ouerthrown or shaken, it can be no more truly called a Church.* Ibid. *Articles are called fundamental, becaus our faith relieth vpon them, as a house doth vpon the foundation.* The same saie manie other Protestants, as is to be seene l. 1. of the Author of Protest. c. 1. nu. 5. to whom I wil ad some later writers. Lord Canterburie sec. 37. p. 319. *If it denie this foundation, it cannot remaine a differing Church, sed transit in non Ecclesiam, but passes awaie into no Church:* The like he saieth sec. 2. p. 162. and sec. 33. p. 240. of the whole Church.

6. Doctor Potter sec. 5. p. 17. *The whole militant Church can not possibly err in anie necessarie point of faith.* p. 18. *A true Church is al one, with a Church not erring in the fonndation.* Sec. 7. p. 74. *By fundamental doctrins, we meane such Catholik doctrins, as principally and essentially perteine to the faith, such as pro-* *Fundamẽtal is Essential*

 Proteſt. vncertaine whether perly cõſtitute a Church. And no Church can be without that, which eſſentially perteineth to faith, and doth conſtitute a Church. And ſec. 5. p. 16. and 21 and ſec. 6 p. 66. maketh fundamental and eſſential, al one.

Not fundamental, not eſſential.

7 Likewiſe Chillingworth c. 3. p. 140. ſaieth: *Not fundamental, id eſt, No eſſential parts of Chriſtianitie.* c. 2. p. 105. *To ſaie, that the Church, whiles it is the true Church, maie err in fundamentals, implies contradiction, and is al one to ſaie; The Church, whiles it is the Church, maie not be the Church.* c. 3. p. 131. *If they* (Proteſtants) *differ in points fundamental, they are not members of the ſame Church, one with an other.* Ibid. p. 177. *That the true Church alwaies shal be the mainteiner and teacher of al neceſſarie truth, yee know we graunt, and muſt graunt. For it is of the eſſence of the Church to be ſo. And anie companie of men were no more a Church without it, then anie thing can be a man, and not be reaſonable.* Item p. 162. *To the verie being of a Church, it is repugnant, that it should err in fundamentals. For if it*

Cõtradictiõ to ſaie, the true Church can err in fundamentals.

Eſſence of the Church to maintaine fundamentals.

should do ſo, it would want the verie eſſence of a Church. And c. 5. p. 291. *A Church remaining a Church, cannot fall into fundamental error, becaus when it does ſo, it is no longer a Church.* And thus haue we ſeene the miſerable vncertaintie of Proteſtants, what a fundamental point is, and alſo what a not-fundamental point is: Which are fundamental points, which are not-fundamental points: And whether a true Church, remaining a true Church, can err in fundemental points, or no. And yet vpon this vncertaintie do they build their maintening of Churches that err in points of faith, their hope of ſaluation in them, and their Communion with them, and their ſeparation from the Roman Church. But now leauing their vncertainties, let vs ſet down ſome certaintie; and firſt, that there are true points of faith, beſids the principal, or capital articles, which are thos, which Proteſtants cal fundamental.

End of the firſt Booke.

THE SECOND BOOKE.

THAT THERE BE TRVE points of faith, beſids the principal, or capital Articles.

FIRST CHAPTER.

1. IN the fift Chapter of the former booke we ſhewed, how Proteſtants, ſometimes, (to wit, when they wil mainteine Churches erring ſinfully in *Not-fundamental points*, or ſaluation in them, their communion with them) affirme, that *Not-fundamental points*, are no

points of faith: that oppoſition againſt them, is no hereſie: and for which, there ſhould be no ſeparation in communion: that denial of them, deſtroieth nether ſauing faith, Church, nor ſaluation; Al which (God willing) we shal refute hereafter. But firſt we wil shew, that there are true points of faith beſids thoſe, which are principal or capital; For this is the ground of al our diſcourſe following.

Manie matters of faith in Scripture, beſid fundamentals.

2. Firſt, whatſoeuer is clearely deliuered in Scripture, and ſufficiently propoſed to vs, is a matter of faith, and ought to be beleued: But there be manie things beſids the principal and capital articles, that are clearely deliuered in Scripture, and ſufficiently propoſed to vs, as that Saint Paul had a cloak, Saint Timothe was ſicklie, and the like. Therfore they alſo are matters of faith, and ought to be beleued.

Matters of faith are to be meaſured by the formal obiect of faith.

3. Secondly, matters of faith are not to be meaſured only by the greatnes of the material obiect, which is beleued, but eſpecially by the formal

obiect of faith, for which it beleues, which is diuine reuelation ſufficiently propoſed to vs. For euerie habit reacheth to whatſoeuer hath is formal obiect. But manie ſmal matters haue the like diuine reuelation ſufficiently propoſed, as that of S. Pauls clooke, and Timothes ſicknes; Therfore they are alike matters of faith.

In faith are both great and leſſer matters.

3. Thirdly, the holie Scripture Mat. 5. and 22. ſaieth plainly, that there are greateſt and leaſt commandements, and that there are Iots or Tittles of the Law. And why not likwiſe, great and les matters of beleif? If anie obiect, that though there be great and litle things commanded to be done, yet litle matters are not commanded to be done vnder paine of loſſe of Gods fauour, or of ſaluation: ſo though litle matters of faith be reuealed, and ought to be beleued when they are ſufficiently propoſed, as teſtifyed by God; yet are we not bound to beleiue them vnder paine of damnation. I anſwer, that litle matters are not commanded to be

Difference betwene matters to be done and to be beleued.

done vnder paine of los of Gods freindship, or of ſaluation, becaus ſmal matters of their nature do not break freindship. For he were an vnreaſonable freind, who for trifles would break freindship, and the end of the law is charitie: but al litle matters teſtified by God, and ſufficiently propoſed to vs, oblidge vs to beleue them, becaus in not beleuing them, we account God not worthie to be beleued in ſuch matters, which is to denie his veracitie, and conſequently his deitie: For who in things equally teſtifyed by God, and equally propoſed to vs as from God, beleueth ſomethings, and not others, beleueth nothing for Gods authoritie, but becaus himſelf iudgeth ſomethings more liklie to be true, then others. For if he beleued anie for Gods authoritie, he would beleue al, which Gods authoritie equally propoſed, doth equally teſtifie. Wherfore we maie keep charitie with God, though we obſerue not litle matters, commanded by him, becaus breach of litle maters, is not op-

differẽce betwixt Faith and charitie touching ſmal matters.

See Chillin. infra c. 4. n. 3. Potter ſec. 5. p. 3. The principal ground on which faith relies, is diuine reuelation. So alſo p. 10.

poſit to charitie, but only to perfection of charitie. But we cannot keep faith with God, if we beleue not ſmal matters, teſtified by him, and ſufficiently propoſed to vs, becaꝰ not beleif of thē, is oppoſit to Gods veracitie, which is the formal obiect of diuine faith, and implicitly ſaieth: God is not worthie of beleef in ſuch matters. For where is the leſt vntruth, there is not diuine or prime veracitie: ſo his veracitie is denied by the leſt vntruth, but not his charitie by the leſt ſin. Hereupon God in the laſt of the Apocalips, threatned to put him out of the book of life, who putteth out one word of that propheſie: but no where threatneth the like, to whoſoeuer shal not keep the leſt thing he commandeth.

5. Holie Fathers alſo teſtifiē, that al things reuealed by God, and ſufficiently propoſed to vs, are matters of faith, in that (as we shal ſee hereafter c. 2.) they account obſtinat error in al ſuch matters, to be formal hereſie, and al ſuch obſtinat errants, formal heretiks: And as Saint Baſil

Theodoret l. 4. c. 17.

saied: we should rather looſe our liues, then ſuffer one ſyllable of Gods Word to perish.

6. Proteſtants likewiſe ſometimes confes, and muſt needs confes, that al, that is clearely teſtified by God, and ſufficiently propoſed; or that thoſe points, which they cal vnfundamental, if they be ſufficiently propoſed, are matters of faith, and of Religion. Whitaker controuer. 2. q. 5. c. 17. *Shal it not be a true Church, if it think not ſincerely of al heads of Religion, if it corrupt anie point of Religion. God forbid, yea it maie be a Church, though it think not ſincerely of ſome parts of faith and Religion, ſo they be not fundamental.* Loe, not fundamentals, are heads, points, and parts of faith and Religion; And controu. 4. q. 1. c. 2. p. 527. *It is not neceſſarie, that faithful men agree in al things, which are of faith, ſo they agree in the higheſt, the cheifeſt, and the neceſſarie.* Behold againe, vnfundamental points, matters of faith. Doctor Potter ſec. 2. p. 38. calleth them *diuine truthes*, and p. 39. inten-

Not fundamentals, are heads, parts, and points of faith, and Religion.

Matters of faith.

ding to declare his diſtinction of fundamental, and not fundametal points, ſaieth: *Points of Religion are wel diſtinguished by Thomas, and Stapleton. Some (ſaie they) are primitiue articles, others are Secundarie.* So that Secondarie, or Not fundamentals, are *points of Religion*, as wel as primitiue or fundamentals. And ſec. 7. p. 71. Being to proue his diſtinction into fundamental and not fundamental, ſaieth: *There be diuers degrees of truths, and errors in Religion*: and commendeth Aquinas for deuiding *the obiect of faith, into that, which is ſo by itſelf, and that, which is by accident and ſecondarily: The firſt, be to that, wherby a man is made bleſſed: the latter, that, which is reucaled, whatſoeuer it be: as that Abraham had two ſonns.* Loe, whatſoeuer is reuealed, is a truth of Religion, and of the obiect of faith. P. 73. *There is a certaine meaſure and quantitie of faith, without which none can be ſaued* (and theſe are his fundamentals) *but euerie thing reuealed, belongs not to this meaſure. It is enough to beleue ſome things by a virtual faith.*

Points of Religion.

Of the obiect of faith. So alſo Chilling. c. 4. p. 193.

Are reuealed and to be beleued.

The like he hath ſec. 6. p. 78. See white in his Def. f. 17.

Behold, vnfundamental points belong to faith, though not to the higheſt meaſure therof, and are to be beleued with a virtual faith. And p. 73. 74. *By fundamental doctrins, we meane ſuch Catholik verities, as principally and eſſentially perteine to faith, ſuch as properly conſtitute a Church, and are neceſſarie, in ordinarie courſe, to be diſtinctly beleued by euerie Chriſtian, that wil be ſaued. Other points of truth, are called Not fundamental, becaus they are not of ſuch abſolute neceſſitie, and doe not primarily belong to the vnitie of faith, or to the eſſence of a Church or to ſaluation of a Chriſtian.* Behold, not fundamental points, belong to the vnitie of faith, though not primarily. And ibid. *It is true, whatſoeuer is reuealed in Scripture, or propounded by the Church out of Scripture, is in ſome ſenſe fundamental, in regard of the diuine authoritie of God, and his word, by which it is recommended, that is, ſuch, as maie not be denied or contradicted, without infidelitie.* Mark; whatſoeuer is reuealed in Scripture, or propounded out of Scripture, is not only a

Belong to the vnitie of faith, though not primarily.

Are ſo fundamental to faith, as it is infidelitie to denie them.

only a matter of faith, but also is so fundamental to faith, as it cannot be denied without infidelitie. And in the like sorte p. 105. *It seemes fundamental to the faith, and for the saluation of euerie member of the Church, that he beleue al such points of faith, as wherof he maie be sufficiently conuinced, that they belong to the doctrin of Iesus Christ.* And p. 111. *It is fundamental to a Christians faith, and necessarie for his saluation, that he beleue al reuealed truths of God, wherof he maie be conuinced, that they are from God.* So that al reuealed truthes, are not only points of faith, but also fundamental points of faith, when they maie be conuinced that they come from God: And surely they maie then be so conuinced, when they are so sufficiently proposed, as points of faith require.

How al reuealed truthes are fundamentals.

7. Chilling worth in answer to the Preface p. 10. repeateth and defendeth the aforesaied words of Doctor Potter p. 105. So that by his confession, al reuealed truths, are not only points of faith, but also fundamental points

of faith, when they can be conuinced to come from God, as al reuealed truths ſufficiently propoſed, can. And ibid. p. 11. diuers times admitteth, not fundamẽtal points to be called points of faith. And ſaieth c. 4. p. 209. *There be manie more points of faith, then there be articles of ſimple beleif, neceſſarie to be explicitly beleued.* Where, by *articles neceſſarie to be explicitly beleued*, he meaneth fundamentals. For thus he expreſſeth himſelf ibib. p. 220. *By fundamental, we meane al, and onely that which is neceſſarie.* And c. 5. p. 285. *By al points of faith, you meane* (ſaieth he) *al fundamental points only, or al ſimply and abſolutly.* So that fundamental points, are not ſimply al points of faith. Ibid. p. 294. *I would faine vnderſtand, why one error in faith, (eſpecially if Not fundamental) ſhould not conſiſt with holines of this Spouſe, this Church, as wel as manie and great Sinns.* So there be errors in faith, and yet not fundamental. And c. 4. p. 193. ſaieth, that, *Not fundamental points are to be beleued, becaus they are ioined with others, that are ne-*

Manie points of faith beſids fundamentals.

Fundamẽtal points arẽ not ſimply al points of faith.

Not fundamentals deliuered by the ſame authoritie, that fundamentals.

ceſſarie to be beleued, and deliuered by the ſame authoritie, which deliuered thes. And if they be to be beleued, and deliuered by the ſame authoritie, which deliuered fundamentals, ſurely they are matters of faith. And (we shal shew hereafter c. 3.) he oftentimes ſaieth, that it is damnable to denie anie reuealed truth ſufficiently propoſed. c. 5. p. 290. *Fundamental errors maie ſignifie, ether ſuch, as are repugnant to Gods commaund, and ſo in their nature damnable* (and thes are errors againſt his not fundamentals) *or ſuch, as are not only meritoriouſly, but remidileſly pernitious, and deſtructiue of ſaluation.* And thes are errors againſt his fundamentals. And ſo errors againſt not fundamentals, are of their nature damnable.

See him ib. p. 218.

8. Lord Canterburie ſec. 38. p. 325. *Bellarmin is forced to grant this: There are manie things de fide, which are not abſolutly neceſſarie to ſaluation. Therfore there is a latitude in the faith.* Where, by *points abſolutly neceſſarie*, he meaneth fundamētals. So there be manie things

Manie things (beſids fundamentals) which are de fide.

 There be points of faith de fide, beſids fundamentals. And ſec. 10. p. 37. *Al which perteines to ſupernatural, diuine, and infallible Chriſtian faith, is not by and by fundamental in the faith, to al men.* Sec. 25. p. 161. he granteth, that *a point of diuine truth, though by ſundrie conſequences deduced from the principles, is yet a point of faith.* P. 163. *The promiſes reach not to this, that the Church shal neuer err, no not in the lighteſt matters of faith.* So that al matters of faith, are not the weightieſt. Sec. 10. p. 29. *Deductions can not be fundamental, and yet to ſome mens ſaluation they are neceſſarie.*

Perteins to diuine faith

9. Thus plainly doe theſe men ſometimes confeſs, that ſuch, as they terme Not fundamental points, are matters of faith: and when they are ſufficiently propoſed, are fundamental to faith, and to ſaluation, and that it is infidelitie to denie them, and errors in them, of their nature, damnable. How contrarie is this to that, which before they ſaied, that not fundamentals were no points of faith, matters of opinion, in which modeſt

L. 1. c. 5. n. 4. & 2. n. 1.

oppoſition is tolerable, and for which no ſeparation of communion ought to be made. And thus hauing shewed, that al reuealed truths whatſoeuer, ſufficiently propoſed for ſuch, are matters of faith: now let vs shew, that al obſtinat or ſinful error againſt ſuch truths, is formal hereſie, and al ſuch oppoſers, formal heretiks.

THAT SINFVL DENIAL of anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed, is true hereſie.

SECOND CHAPTER.

1. IT ſeemeth ſo euident, that al ſinful oppoſition or denial of anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed, or which, for the oppoſers fault, is not ſufficiently propoſed, is true hereſie, as it cā ſcarce be proued by anie thing more euident. For what doe Chriſtiās conceaue by the name of *hereſie*, but ſinful oppoſition to ſome point of

L. Canterb. p. 198. hereſies properly cannot be, but in doctrin of faith.

See S. Thomas 2. 2. q. 11. a. 2.

Christian faith: or what by an *heretik*, but such an oppoſer? Yet will I endeauour to make it more manifeſt.

2. And firſt, out of the definitions or deſcriptions of hereſie or heretiks, giuen in holie Scripture. Rom. vltima v. 28. *I deſire ye Brethren, mark them, that make diſſentions and ſcandales, contrarie to the doctrin which ye haue learned, and auoid them.* 2. Theſſal. 3. *we denounce vnto ye Brethren, in the name of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, that ye withdraw yourſelues from euerie Brother walking inordinatly, and not according to the tradition, which they haue receaued from vs:* And Gal. 1. *Albeit we, or an Angel from heauen, euangelize to ye, beſids that which we haue euangelized to ye, be he anathema.* In al which places, an heretik, or hereſie, is deſcribed, not by oppoſition to fundamental points only, but by oppoſition *to the doctrin which we haue learned, againſt the Tradition which we haue receaued, or againſt which Saint Paul had preached.* But Not fundamental points, are parte of that which we haue learned, parte

Hereſie contrarie to doctrin learned.

Contrarie to Tradition.

Contrarie to Saint Pauls preaching

C. 8. l. 1.

of that tradition which we haue receaued, and parte of that, which S. Paul preached. Therfore ſinful oppoſition to them, is true hereſie according to Scripture,

3. Secondly, I proue it out of the deſcriptions of hereſie, and heretiks, giuen by the holie Fathers, of whom, no one deſcribeth hereſie or heretiks, by oppoſition to only principal or capital points of faith, but by only oppoſition to Scripture, or doctrin of the Catholik Church. Saint Hierom. in in Galat. 5. *He is an heretik, who vnderſtands the Scripture otherwiſe, then the Holie Ghoſt would.* Saint Auguſtin lib. 18. de Ciuitate c. 51. *The diuel raiſed vp heretiks, who vnder the name of Chriſtians, ſhould reſiſt Chriſtian doctrin.* And addeth, *who in the Church doe hold anie vnſound and naughtie thing pertinaciouſly, are heretiks.* Lib. 7. de Geneſi ad literam c. 9. *They are not heretiks, but becaus they vnderſtand the Scripture wrongly.* And lib. de hæreſibus in fine. After he had reckoned diuers hereſies, wherof manie are not againſt

An hereſie deſcribed by the Fathers.

Contrarie to ſenſe of Scripture.

To Chriſtiã doctrin.

anie principal point of faith, he thus pronounceth: *whoſoeuer holdeth anie one of thē, is no Catholik Chriſtian*: which is as much, as to ſaie, *he is an heretik*. And both he, and al antiquitie accounted Donatiſts, heretiks, for their error about rebaptization. *who yet*, (ſaieth Lord Canterb. ſec. 35. p. 300.) *for ought I know, did hold the foundation*. And Morton in his Grand Impoſture c. 15. p. 418. *The queſtion of Rebaptization, was no fundamental error*. And Chillingworth c. 1. p. 41. *Saint Cyprian and Stephen might both be ſaued, becaus their contrarie beleif* (about Rebaptization) *was not touching anie point conteined in Scriptnre*. Nether can they ſaie, that the Donatiſts error about Rebaptization, was fundamental, vnles they wil damne S. Cyprian, who confeſſedly held that error, but without obſtinacie, as the Donatiſts did. Saint Epiphan. in Saint Hierom. l. 3. contra Ruffinum *Manie hereſies haue been caſt out of the Church for one word or twoe contrarie to faith*. He ſaieth not, contrarie to the foundation of

And ſo doth Chilling. c. 7. p. 398.

Donatiſts heretiks, yet held the foundation.

L. Canterb. p. 315. Potter p. 103.

faith, but abſolutly, *to faith*, Saint Gregorie Nazianzene Orat. 49. *There can be nothing more dangerous, then thoſe heretiks, who with one word, as with a drop of poiſon, infect our Lords true and ſimple doctrin, and Apoſtolical tradition.* But who err in Not fundamental points of faith, doe ſo: For they are parte of Chriſts doctrin, and Apoſtolical Tradition. Herupon Caluin 4. Inſtitut. c. 2. paragr. 5. ſaieth: *Auguſtin putteth this difference betweene Heretiks, and Schiſmatiks, that they, by falſe doctrins, corrupt the ſinceritie of faith, but thes, &c.* And in 1. Corinth. c. 11. v. 13. *The Fathers put hereſie, in diſſention of doctrin.* So clearely he confeſſeth, that the Fathers account anie corruption of Chriſts faith or doctrin, to be hereſie. And Perkins Galat. 5. v. 11. *The Fathers condemned as Heretiks, who erred in ſmal matters, holding the foundation, as Vigilantius Nouatus, &c.*

Contrarie to Chriſts doctrin.

Fathers put hereſie in corruption of faith.

In diſſetion of doctrin.

4. Proteſtants alſo define hereſie, to be an obſtinat error in anie point of faith. Wittenbergenſes in Refuta-

Obſtinat error in one point is hereſie.

tione orthodoxi conſenſus p. 73. *Not euerie heretik impugned al and euerie article of faith: but for the moſt parte, each heretik impugned one only purpoſely; whom neuertheles, being obſtinat in their error, the Church rightly condemned as Heretiks.* Schuſſelburg l. 2. Theol. Caluin art. 1. *we are certaine out of the word of God, that obſtinat error in anie falſe doctrin, doth make heretiks.* Thus the Lutherans: Beza li. de puniendis hereticis p. 150. *we cal them properly heretiks, who pretending great pietie, yet doe not yeeld to the admonition of the Church: and by falſe doctrin, doe break the peace and confeſsion of the Church.* And ibid. *The Apoſtle in his epiſtle to the Romans doth not name heretiks, but plainly defineth thē: For when he had admonished the brethren, that they should note thos who make diſſentions and ſcandales, he addeth, againſt that doctrin which you haue learnt: wherfore where thes two meet, there is hereſie according to the Apoſtles definition, then the which we ought not to ſeek anie better.* Fulk in his Reionder to Briſtow p. 82. *The*

In anie fals doctrin.

See VVitak. cont. 2. q. 5. c. 17.

In not yeelding to the Church.

Definition of an heretik by Scripture.

Parlament determineth Hereſie by contrarietie to the Canonical Scripture: And p. 71. *I ſay, an Heretik is he, which in the Church obſtinatly mainteineth an opinion contrarie to the Scripture.* Pleſſie de Eccleſia c. 2. *we cal them heretical Churches, who err in faith.* Moulins lib. 1. contra Peron c. 7. *They are called Heretiks, who are ſeparated from the orthodox Church, for ſome error in faith.* Bucanus in locis q. 33. *hereſie, is properly diſſention in doctrin.* Morton lib. 1. Apol. c. 3. *whoſoeuer anie waie departeth from the Catholik faith, is an heretik, ſaieth Thomas, to whom ſubſcribeth Occam, and that rightly.* Tom. 2. l. 5. c. 13. *To be an heretik, is to diſſent from Scripture.* And in his Grand Impoſture c. 5. p. 325. *To be vnwilling, ether to learne, or to yeeld to manifeſt truth, is proper to a Satanical Synagog.* Iuel in Defence of the Apologiæ p. 44. *For iuſt proof of Hereſie three things neceſſarily are required 1. that it be an error. 2. that it be an error againſt the truth of Gods word 3. that it be ſtoutly and wilfully mainteind.* Sharpe de Notis Eccleſ. col. 333.

By the Parlament.

In not yeelding to manifeſt truth.

That is an heretical Church, which obstinatly holdeth errors in doctrin. Chillingworth c. 2. p. 101. *herese is nothing but a manifest deuiation from, and an opposition to the faith.* The like he hath c. 4. p. 199. Doctor Potter sec. 2. p. 55. *Whosoeuer, ether wilfully opposes anie Catholik veritie mainteined by this Church, (of Saints) or the Catholik visible Church, as do heretiks &c.* sec. 4. p. 95. *He is iustly estemed an heretik, becaus he yeelds not to Scripture sufficiently propounded to him.* Ibid. p. 124. *An obstinate standing out against euident Scripture sufficiently cleared vnto him, makes an heretik.* Sec. 7. p. 110. *where the reuealed wil or word of God is sufficiently propounded, there he, that opposeth, is conuinced of error, and he who is thus conuinced, is an heretik.* And ibid. p. 105. 106. *It seemes fundamental to the faith, and for the saluation of euerie member of the Church, that he acknowledg and belewe al such points of faith, as wherof he maie be sufficiently conuinced, that they belong to the doctrin of Iesus Christ. For he, that being sufficiently conuinced, doth oppose,*

In oppositiō to faith.

In oppositiō to the Catholik visible Church.

In not yeelding to scripture.

In oppositiō to anie point of faith sufficiently conuinced.

is oſtbinate an heretik, and finally ſuch a one as excluds himſelf out of beauen. Feild l. 2. de Eccleſ. c. 3. *Freedom from fundamental error, may be found among Heretiks.* And l. 1. c. 13. *Heretiks are they that obſtinatly perſiſt in error cõtrarie to the Churches faith.* Behold, how obſtinat oppoſition to the doctrin of the Scripture, of the word of God, of the Catholik viſible Church, or of anie point of faith, which maie be conuinced to belong to the doctrin of Chriſt, is true, proper, and damnable hereſie. The English Proteſtant Church alſo excommunicateth al, *whoſoeuer shal affirme that the* (39.) *articles are in anie parte ſuperſtitious or erroneous.* And yet I hope they wil not ſay, that euerie parte of their 39. articles is fundamental in their ſenſe. Wherfor they may be iuſtly excommunicated out of the Church, who affirme ſome not fundamental point, to be erroneous. And art. 33. who are excõmunicated, are cut from the vnitie of the Church. Wherfore, when Proteſtants wil haue only obſtinat oppoſition to ſome prin- *Sup. c. 2. n. 2. l. 1.*

cipal or capital point of faith, to be true and proper hereſie, they ſpeak nether with Scripture, Fathers, nor with themſelues. Nether haue they anie authoritie of Scripture, Father, or other reaſon to limit hereſie to obſtinat oppoſition of fundamental points; but onely, leaſt they ſhould condemn ſome of their Brethren for heretiks, whom they cannot denie, but err in ſome points of faith ſufficiently propoſed, or which, (if it were not their fault) would be ſo propoſed to them, and conſequently, err obſtinatly and ſinfully. And if we ask them, what ſin they call, ſinful error in anie point of faith, if not Hereſie, they can not tel. But now hauing ſeen, that euerie ſinful error againſt anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed, or which would be ſo propoſed, if it were not the errants fault, is true hereſie: Let vs ſee, that euerie ſuch error is damnable, becaus ſometimes Proteſtants wil confes that al ſuch error is hereſie, but denie, that al hereſie is damnable: as is euident

Al ſin againſt faith is ether hereſie, or infidelitie.

by what we haue rehearſed of their doctrin in the ſecond Chapter l. 1. n. 2. And Chillingworth c. 5. p. 278. putteth *fundamental hereſies, and others, which* (ſaieth he) *doe not plainly deſtroie ſaluation, nor of themſelues damne no man.*

Some hereſies though not fundamental.

That ſinful denial of anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed, is damnable.

THIRD CHAPTER.

1. THat al ſinful oppoſition or denial of anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed, or which would be ſo propoſed, if it were not the oppoſers fault, is damnable, followeth out of that we haue proued, that al ſuch oppoſition, is true hereſie. For that al true hereſie, is damnable, is euident out of holie Scripture, Fathers, Reaſon, and Confeſſion of Proteſtants. For the Apoſtle Galat.

VVhitak. cont. 2. q 4. c 2. non omnes errores circa fidem ſunt lathales, ſicut nec omnes morbi.

Heresie numbred by the Apostle among damnable sinns.

5. v. 20. and 21. reckoneth sects or heresies, among those sinns, of which he saieth: *who doe such things, shal not obteine the Kingdom of God.* And maketh no more distinction of heresie, then he doth of the other sinns. And Galat. 1. v. 8. saieth generally: *If anie Euangelize, beside that, which ye haue receaued, be he accursed.* And Tit. 3. v. 10. *Auoid a man, that is an heretik, after the first and second admonition, knowing that he, who is such a one, is subuerted, and sinneth, being condemned by his owne iudgment.* But what hindereth to obteine the Kingdom of God, what deserueth a Curse, and condemneth a man in his owne iudgment, is doubtles damnable. Our Sauiour also Ioan. 10. calleth heretiks *Theeues and Robbers.* And Apocal. vltim. v. 19. it is saied. *If anie shal diminish of the words of this Book of this propheſie, God shal take awaie his parte out of the Book of life.* And if it be damnable to diminish a word of Gods Book, much more damnable is it, to diminish some point of his faith or doctrin. The same also

Heretiks condemned by their own iudgments.

followeth

followeth out of thos places of Scripture, which we shal cite hereafter, which commaund vs to flie the companie of heretiks. C. 9. n. 2.

2. Holie Fathers also teach the same. Tertullian de præscript. c. 2. *Hereſies are to deſtroie faith: and do bring euerlaſting death.* And c. 37. *If they be heretiks, they can be no Chriſtians.* And surely it is damnable, to be no Christian. Saint Cyprian Epist. 73. *Nether faith, nor Church, are common to vs with heretiks.* And he addeth, that both by *the teſtimonie of the Ghoſpel and Apoſtle, heretiks are called Anti-Chriſts.* The like he saieth Epist. 40. 55. 74. 75. and lib. de vnitate and Firmilian Epist. 75. Saint Augnstin l. 2. contra Crescon. c. 10. saieth to the Donatists. *Ye haue no Chriſtian Church.* l. 3. de Baptis. c. 19. *Al heretiks and Schiſmatiks, are falſe Chriſtians.* L. 21. de Ciuitate c. 25. *An heretik, is worſe then an Infidel.* And in Enchiridio c. 5. *Chriſt, in name only, is found with anie heretiks.* Saint Gregorie Nazian. Orat. 21. *Driue awaie heretiks, as the*

Hereſie brings damnation.

Heretiks no Chriſtians.

Are Anti-Chriſts.

False Chriſtians.

VVorſe then infidels.

 Denial of anie point of faith ſtaine and deſtruction of the Church, and the poiſon of truth. And Saint Athanaſe in his Creed, *whoſoeuer wil be ſaued, before al things, he muſt hold the Catholik faith: which vnles he keep whole and inuiolate, without doubt he shal perish euerlaſtingly.* But heretiks hold not the Catholik faith whole and inuiolate. Therfore &c. S. Fulgentius de fide c. 38. & 39. *Hold moſt firmely, and doubt not at al, that not only Pagans, but alſo al Iewes, Heretiks, and Schiſmatiks, who end this life out of the Catholik Church, shal goe into euerlaſting fire prouided for the Deuil and his Angels.* Finally Saint Chryſoſtom in Galat. 1. expreſly ſaieth that the leſt error in matter or faith deſtroieth faith. *That he* (S. Paul) *might shew that anie litle thing wrongly mingled doth corrupt the whole, he ſaid the Ghoſpel was ouerthrown. For as he who in the Kings coine doth clip but a litle of the ſtamp, maketh the whole of no value: ſo who deſtroieth the leſt particle of ſound faith, is wholy corrupted.* Where then are they who condemn vs, becaus we contend with Heretiks, and ſay: there is no dif-

Al that die heretiks, are damned.

The leſt mixture corrupteth faith.

ference betwixt vs and them, but that al our diſcord is for ambition to dominere. Let them heare what Paul ſaieth, that they had ouerthrown the Ghoſpel who had brought in neuer ſo litle noueltie. Which words are more cleare then to be eluded by Chillingworths Anſwer c. 6. p. 381. that Saint Chryſoſtom by *Faith* meaneth only Fundamental points of faith. For Saint Chryſoſt. expreſly ſpeaketh of *litle things, and leſt particles of faith, and neuer ſo litle noueltie.* Beſids his expoſition is voluntarie, not proued out of one word of Saint Chryſoſtom. And his reaſon, becaus by *Faith* is oftentimes meant onely Fundamental points, is Sophiſtical. For it is a particularibus and diſſimilibus. For *Faith* is neuer taken for anie part of it, but when that is ſome way declared by the ſpeaker or writer. Becaus al words are to be meant according to their proprietie and latitude, vnles the contrarie be declared, els we could not be certaine how words were to be taken. Which were to deſtroie the end of ſpeech and

writing. Far more teſtimonies of Fathers might be brought to this purpos, but whom theſe ſuffice not, none will ſuffice.

3. Reaſon alſo conuinceth, that al hereſie is damnable. For it is a ſin in a weightie matter, to wit, againſt faith. Moreouer hereſie, is a ſinful Not beleif, or Disbeleif of ſome diuine truth ſufficiently propoſed to come from God: which is in effect not to beleue God in that truth: or to denie Gods veracitie, *and to giue God the Lie*; as Chillingworth ſpeaketh, or as Doctor Potter ſaieth: *An act of Infidelitie*. And an act of infidelitie, or to giue God the Lie, and to denie Gods veracitie, is doubtles moſt damnable. And, as the ſame Potter ſaieth ſec. 7. p. 109. *In this caſe, the difference is not great, betweene him that is wilfully blinde, and him, that knowingly gainesaieth the truth*: but knowingly to gaine ſaie diuine truth, is moſt damnable, and a ſin againſt the Holie Ghoſt. Nether is there anie ground in holie Scripture, Fathers, or Reaſon, to

See here n. 5. 6.

Note this. Sinful ignorance excuſeth not frō hereſie or ſin. See alſo Chilling. c. 7. p. 404.

denie al hereſie to be damnable: But ſome Proteſtants denie it, merely, becaus they cannot denie, but that ſome of their Churches and Brethren culpably hold ſome hereſies, whom they are ashamed to confes, to be in ſtate of damnation.

4. Proteſtants likewiſe ſometimes confes that al hereſie is damnable. Luther in Explicat. Symboli Tom. 7. fol. 124. *No heretik is ſaued, vnles he returne to the Church, and in al things think, doe, and teach the ſame.* And l. de votis Tom. 2. fol. 272. *If anie denie Marie to be a Virgin, or doe not beleue anie other ſingular article of faith, he is damned.* King Iames Reſp. and Peron p. 384. *Damneth al, who* (ſaieth he) *haue departed from the faith of the Catholik Church, and are become heretiks.* Apologie of the Church of England. *Hereſie is a forſaking of ſaluation and departure from the bodie and Spirit of Chriſt.* Idem: *we pronounce al them damned, who haue a wiked opinion of anie point of Chriſtian Religion.* French Proteſtants in their cene. *I excommu-*

No heretik ſaued.

Caluin Act. 24. Deteſtabiles iubet haberi hereticos, Spiritus Dei. Beza de pun. har. p. 21. non poteſt non eſſe grauiſſimū hereſeos crimē. ſee p. 119. See Iuel. p. 43. 314.

nicate al Heretiks. Feild Append. p. 23. *we doe not admit anie ſectarics into the communion of the true Catholik Church.* White in Preface to his way: *In queſtions of faith whoſoeuer erreth, looſeth no les then his ſoule therby.* Hooker of iuſtific. §. 11. *Hereſie is heretically mainteined by ſuch, as obſtinatly hold it, after holeſome admonition. Of thes I make no doubt, but their condemnation, without an actual repentance, is inevitable.* Whitaker Præfat in controu. *One hereſie, is ſufficient to damnation.* And controu. 2. q. 4. c. 2. *No heretiks can be ſaued.* And ibid. q. 5. c. 2. *we confes that heretiks are to be fled.* Hooker l. 3. p. 129. *Hereſies which are not actually repented of, exclude quite and cleane from ſaluatiõ.* More of the like Confeſſions of Proteſtants, maie be ſeene lib. 1. of the Author of Proteſtancie c. 1. to which I wil ad the Confeſſions of late English Writers.

One hereſie damneth.

5. Doctor Potter ſect. 2. p. 55. *Whoſoeuer, ether wilfully oppoſes anie Catholik veritie mainteined by this Church* (of Saints) *or the Catholik*

visible Church, as do heretiks, their condition is damnable. Sec. 7. p. 74. *It is true, that whatsoeuer is reuealed in Scripture, or propounded by the Church out of Scripture, is in some sorte fundamental, in regard of the diuine authoritie of God, and his word, by which it is recōmended, that is, such, as maie not be denied, or contradicted without infidelitie.* And p. 110. *Where there is no such impediment (* of incapacitie*) and the reuealed wil or word of God is sufficiently propounded, there he that oppoſeth, is conuinced of error, and he who is thus conuinced, is an heretik, and hereſie is a work of the flesh, which excludeth from heauen.* Galat. 5. v. 20. p. 105. *It seemes fundamental to the faith, and to saluation of euerie Christian member, that he acknowledg, and beleue al such points of faith, wherof he maie be sufficiently conuinced, that they belong to the doctrin of Iesus Christ. For he that being sufficiently conuinced, doth oppose, is obstinat, an heretik, and finally such a one, as excludes himself out of heauen.* And p. 111. *It is fundamental to a Christians faith, and neceſſarie for his salua-*

Condition of heretiks, damnable.

whatsoeuer is reuealed, is fundamental.

Infidelitie, to denie anie point sufficiently proposed.

See Andreivs cont. Apol. Bellar. c. 6. p. 132.

Fundamental to faith and saluation.

Fundamētal to saluation to beleue al sufficiently proposed.

 Denial of anie point of faith

tion, that he beleue al reueated truths of God, wherof he maie be conuinced that they are from God. Sec. 4. p. 99. *Hereſie is a greiuous crime, where it is true.* And as Chillingworth ſaieth in Anſwer to the Preface p. 8. *He giues them only, hope of pardon of errors, who are deſirous, and according to the proportion of their opportunities and abilities, induſtrious to finde the truth: or at leaſt truly repentant, that they haue not beene ſo.*

To diſbeleue what is ſufficiētly propoſed, is to giue God, the Lie.

6. Chillingworth in Anſwer to the Preface p. 10. and 11. *To denie, or disbeleue anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed to his vnderſtanding, as a truth reuealed by God, is to giue God the Lie.* P. 18. *If this propoſal be ſo ſufficient, as the partie, to whom it is made, ſhould, and (but for his own fault) would haue been conuinced of the diuine veritie of the doctrin propoſed, a fault I confes, it is, and without repentance, damnable, if, al circumſtances conſidered, the propoſal be ſufficient.* P. 19. *When God hath interpoſed his teſtimonie on one ſide, or other, ſo that ether they do ſee it, and wil not, or were it not for their owne voluntarie and auoi-*

A damnable fault.

Tomšie, and wil not ſee truth, is damnable. See Morton Impo. p. 372.

dable fault, might and should see it, and doe not, let al such errors be as damnable as you please to make them. P. 21. If anie Papist or Protestant be betraied into, or kept in anie error, by anie sin of his wil, such error is, as the cause of it, damnable. P. 23. There is, (as matters now stand) as great necessitie of beleuing thos truths of Scripture, which are Not fundamental, as thos, that are. And p. 24. he citeth Doctor Potter saying. If anie be negligent in seeking truth, vnwilling to finde it, ether doth see it, and wil not: or might see it, and wil not, his case is dangerous, and without repentance, desperat. And Chillingworth addeth: He secureth none, that in matter of Religion, are sinfully, that is, willingly erroneous. And c. 3. p. 138. You infer out of Doctor Potters words, that al errors are alike damnable, if the manner of propounding the contrarie truths, be not different: which (for ought I know) al Protestants, and al, that haue sense, must graunt. And ibid. p. 161. we are obliged vnder paine of damnation, to beleue al, wherof we may be sufficiently assured, that Christ taught it his

Alike necessitie to beleue not fundamentals, as fundamentals.

Negligence in seeking truth, is damnable.

None sinfully erroneous, is secure.

Al error alike damnable, if the prepoſal be alike.

Apoſtles, his Apoſtles, the Church. And p. 137. namely heſaieth of a Not fundamental point: *It maie, by accident, become fundamental, becaus it maie be ſo propoſed, that the denial of it, wil draw after it, the denial of this fundamental truth: That al, which God ſaies, is true.* And al that is ſo ſufficiently propoſed, as matters of faith ought to be, are propoſed in ſuch ſort. Ibid pag. 134. *Among the conditions of ſaluation, which Chriſt requireth, one is, that we beleue what he has reuealed, when it is ſufficiently declared to haue beene reuealed by him.* And 158. *If the cauſe of the error be ſome voluntarie, and auoidable fault the error is in itſelf ſinful, and conſequētly in its owne nature dawnable.* And c. 5. p. 280. *Capital danger may ariſe from errors, though not fundamental.* See p. 278.

See alſo p. 41.

7. Lord Canterburie ſec. 37. p. 320. *It is true, that error in points not fundamental maie be damnable to ſome men, though they hold it not againſt their conſcience. As namely, when they hold an error in ſome dangerous points, which grate*

vpon the foundation, and yet wil nether ſeek the meanes to know the truth, nor accept and beleue truth, when it is known eſpecially being men able to iudge. And p. 342. *I agree, that he which hopes for ſaluatiõ, muſt beleue the Catholik faith whole and entire in euerie point.* And ſec. 35. p. 289. ſaieth. *A matter of faith, and ſo of ſaluation too.* As if euerie matter of faith, were alſo matter of ſaluation. And both he p. 24. 31. 139. 140. 162. 165. Chillingworth p. 14. 277. 279. 281. 285. And Potter ſec. 5. p. 19. ſec. 7. p. 58. 78. ſpeak *of abſolutly or ſimply fundamental, or neceſſarie points*, which inſinuateth, that there are others truly fundamẽtal, or truly neceſſarie, beſids thos which are abſolutely ſuch. The Author of the Preface to K. Iames before Iuels workes. *In things neceſſarie onely, neceſſitate Præcepti, not onely witting and willing diſobedience, but alſo wilful and affected ignorance doth condemn.*

A matter of faith, is a matter of ſaluation.

8. In which Confeſſions of the Proteſtants, I would haue the Reader to mark wel thes points. Firſt, that al

Points to be noted.

1.

errors, fundamental or Not fundamental, are alike damnable, if the contrarie truth be alike propoſed.
2. Secondly, that a Not fundamental point ſufficiently propoſed, is ſo fundamental to faith and ſaluation, as to contradict it, is infidelitie, and to giue
3. God the Lie. Thirdly, that who beleueth not anie one diuine truth ſufficiently propoſed, is an heretik, and excludes himſelf out of heauen.
4. Fourthly, that who is negligent to ſeek truth, or vnwilling to finde it, is,
5. without repentance, deſperat. Fiftly, that who, were it not for their auoidable faults, might, and ſhould ſee truth, and do not, their error is damnable, and that they ſecure none, who is ſinfully erroneous. And if they would conſtantly ſtand to thes points, there would be litle cõtrouerſie about fundamental, and not fundamental points. For this is to grant plainly, that no points of faith are ſo fundamental, as they are ſufficient to ſauing faith, Church, and ſaluation, if other points be ſufficiently propoſed and not bele-

Proteſtants ſome times grant al the queſtion.

Magna eſt veritas & praualet.

ued, or for the not beleuers fault, not ſo propoſed: nor anie ſo not fundamental, as they are not neceſſarie to ſauing faith, Church, and ſaluation to be beleued actually, if they be ſufficiently propoſed, and neceſſarie to be virtually beleued, whether they be ſo propoſed, or no. And al the queſtion betwixt Catholiks and Proteſtants is, whether anie points of faith be thus fundamental, and anie thus Not-fundamental, or no. But becaus Proteſtants can not denie, but that ſome Churches, which they mainteine, haue had the truth, againſt which they err, ſufficiently propoſed to them, or if it were not their auoidable fault, might and should ſee the truth, therfor when they are to defend ſuch Churches, they forget this doctrin. But now hauing proued, that to err ſinfully, in anie matter of faith, is both hereſie, and deſtroieth ſaluation, let vs alſo proue, that it deſtroieth true ſauing faith.

That vincible and ſinful error againſt anie point of Chriſtian faith ſufficiently propoſed, deſtroieth true ſauing faith.

FOVRTH CHAPTER.

1. THat vincible and ſinful error againſt anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed, deſtroieth true ſauing faith, is euident out of this, that
c. 2. al ſuch error is true hereſie, as is before proued, and hereſie is oppoſit to ſauing faith, as is euident out of the definitions of hereſie, related before c. 2. out of Scripture, Fathers, and Proteſtants: and alſo out of the teſtimonies of holie Fathers c. 3. n. 2. that hereſie is the deſtruction of faith, the poiſon of faith, that heretiks haue nether faith, nor Church, common with Catholiks, haue Chriſt only in name: that heretiks are no true Chriſtians, are falſe Chriſtians, are Chriſtians

only in name, are worſe then Infidels, are Anti Chriſts. Which euidently shew, that hereſie is oppoſit to ſauing faith, and heretiks, to Catholiks. For if they be no Chriſtians, much les are they Catholiks. And Proteſtants ſometimes giue the ſame iudgment of them. For thus Luther in caput 7. Math. tom 7. *Heretiks, are not Chriſtians:* Magdeburgians in Præfat. Centur. 6. *They are Anti-Chriſts, and diuels.* Beza de puniendis hæreticis. *They are infidels, and Apoſtataes.* Whitaker Controu. 2. q. 5. c. 2. *the name of Catholik, is oppoſit to Heretiks.* Morton l. 1. Apolog. c. 7. *Ether we muſt giue the name of Catholiks to Proteſtants, or we muſt denie thē the name of Chriſtians.* And ſurely, who are no Chriſtians, but Anti-Chriſts, diuels, infidels, and Apoſtataes, and oppoſit to Catholiks, haue not ſauing faith. And though Eſtius in primā Ioan. 4. and 3. diſtinſt. 23. paragr. 13. think, that, what truth heretiks beleue, they beleue it with diuine faith, yet he denieth, that their faith is Catholik, or ſimply faith, be-

Proteſtants ſaie that heretiks are no Chriſtians.

The queſtiō is of ſauing faith.

caus it is not entire faith: nor euer ſaid, that it is a ſauing faith, as Proteſtants ſaie, and is the main queſtion betweene vs and them.

Heretiks make ſhipwrack of faith.

2. Secondly, I proue it out of Scripture. 1. Timoth. 1. v. 20. where certaine heretiks are ſaied, to *haue made Shipwrack of faith.* And c. 4. v. 1. *In the latter daies, ſome shal depart from faith harkning to ſpirits of error, and doctrins of Diuels.* And Epiſt. 2. c. 2. v. 18. he ſaieth of other heretiks: *They haue fallen from truth, and ouerturned the faith of ſome.* But who haue made Shipwrack of faith, haue departed from faith, haue fallen from truth, and whos faith is ouerturned, haue not ſauing faith.

Formal obiect of faith, is diuine reuelatiõ ſufficiẽtly propoſed.

3. Thirdly, I proue that ſinful error againſt anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed, deſtroieth true ſauing faith, becaus it deſtroieth the true formal obiect of diuine faith. For the formal obiect of diuine faith, is whole diuine truth reuealed by God, and ſufficiently propoſed to vs, that it is from God. But voluntarie

See S. Thomas 2.2.q.1.

error

error againſt diuine truth reuealed, and ſufficiently propoſed, taketh awaie this formal obiect. Therfore it taketh awaie diuine faith. For what taketh awaie the formal obiect of anie habit or power, taketh awaie the habit itſelf. The Minor is euident. The Maior alſo is cleare. For what other can be ſaied to be the formal obiect of faith? And it is confeſſed by Proteſtants. For thus Lord Canterburie ſec. 38. p. 344. *we beleue them for the ſame formal reaſon in al, namely, becaus they are reuealed, from, and by God, and ſufficiētly applied in his word, and by the Churches miniſtration.* And Doctor Potter ſec. 5. p. 3. *The formal obiect of faith, is diuine reuelation.* The ſame he hath p. 8. and 10. And Chillingworth c. 1. p. 35. *Faith is an aſſent to diuine reuelation, vpon the authoritie of the reuealer.* And hereupon the ſame Chillingworth p. 23. ſaieth: *He that doth not beleue al the vndoubted parts of the vndoubted books of Scripture, can hardly beleue anie, nether haue we reaſon to beleue, he doth ſo.* And the ſame I ſay

See Vſher Serm. before K. Iames p. 39 Morton Appeal. l. 1. c. 1. ſee 1.

He that beleueth not al Scripture, truly beleueth none.

of vndoubted points of Christs doctrin.

4. Fourthly I proue, that sinful error against anie point of faith sufficiently proposed, destroieth true-sauing faith, becaus it destroieth the true vnitie therof. For true diuine faith, is wholy one, and the same in al true Beleuers. But who sinfully beleue not some points of faith sufficiently proposed, which others beleue, haue not wholy one and the same faith Therefore &c. The Minor is euident. The Maior I proue out of Scripture, Fathers, Reason, and Confession of Protestants. The Scripture Ephes. 4. saieth: *One God, one Faith, one Baptisme.* Where, not only faith is saied to be one, but also it is saied to be one, as God, and baptisme are, which are wholy one. And this same, proue al thos places of Scripture, which teach, that the Church is one, which hereafter we shal cite. For seeing the profession of faith is part of the forme of the Church, she could not be wholy one, if her forme were not

Scriptnre saieth that faith is wholy one.

L. Cāt. p. 36. whatsoever is fundamental in the faith, is fundamental to the Church, which is one by the vnitie of faith.

altogether one.

5. The Fathers also teach the same. For thus Saint Ireneus l. 1. c. 4. *She, who is the vniuersal Church, hath one and the same faith in al the world.* Saint Cyprian l. de vnitate: *God is one, and Christ is one, and his Church is one, and faith is one, vnitie cannot be deuided, nor one Bodie separated by disunion of the ioints.* Saint Hilarie l. 11. de Trinitate: *Who doubteth, but it is beside faith, which is beside one faith?* And lib. contra Constantium. *What is beside one faith, is not faith, but perfidiousnes.* Saint Optatus l. 5. *If you giue an other faith, giue also an other God.* Saint Leo serm. 4 de Natiuitate: *If it be not one, it is not faith.* And thes Fathers saie simply ad absolutely, that faith is one, without anie restriction to fundamẽtal points. And it is both voluntarie, and Sophistical, to limit that to a parte, which is spoken absolutly, when the speaker giues no occasion of such limitation: Reason also cõuinceth, that faith is w holy one in euery true beleuer. For (as we saied before) the formal obiect of true

Likwise Fathers.

See S. Chrysostom in Gal. 1. to. 4. col. 812.

Vna fides ab hæreticorũ erroribus separatur.

N. 3.

faith, is diuine reuelation ſufficiently propoſed: but this is wholy one and the ſame in al beleuers, and conſequently alſo faith, which (as al other habits) taketh its vnitie and diſtinction from its formal obiect.

And Proteſtants alſo.

6. Proteſtants alſo ſometimes confès, that faith is wholy and entirely one, and vndeuided. Luther in caput 7. Math. Tom. 5. fol. 74. *Faith muſt be round, that is, in al articles, beleuing howſoeuer litle matters. For who doth not rightly beleue one article, doth not rightly beleue in al: as Saint Iames ſaieth, who offendeth in one, is made guiltie of al.* And in tria Symbola Tom. 7. fol. 141. *Chriſtian faith muſt be entire and perfect euerie waie. For albeit it maie be weak and faint, yet muſt it needs be entire and true.* In caput 7. Deutron. tom. 3. fol. 56. *Faith ſuffereth nothing, and the word beareth with nothing: but the word muſt be perfectly pure, and the doctrin alwaies wholy Holſome.* And tom. 1. German. Epiſt. ad Albertum: *He doth not ſatiffie, if in other things he confès Chriſt and his word. For who denieth Chriſt in one*

Faith beleues little matters.

Entire euerie waye.

article or word, denieth him in al, ſeing there is one only Chriſt, the ſame in al his words. Wittenbergenſes in Refutat. Orthodoxi Conſenſus p. 73. *As he, who keepeth al the Law, but offendeth in one, is (witnes Saint Iames) guiltie of al: So who beleueth not one word of Chriſt, though he ſeeme to beleue the other articles of the Creed, yet beleueth nothing, and is damned, as incredulous.* Scuſſelburg l. 1. Theolog. Caluin. art. 1. *Moſt truly wrote Saint Chryſoſtom in 1. Galat. He corrupteth the whole doctrin, who ſubuerteth it in the leſt article. Moſt truly ſaied Ambroſe Epiſt. ad Demetriadem: He is out of the number of the faithful, and lot of Saints, who diſſenteth in anie point from the Catholik truth.* Field l. 3. c. 3. *There are ſome things explicitè credenda, ſome things implicitè: which, whoſoeuer wil be ſaued, muſt beleue them, at leaſt implicitè and in general.*

VVho diſſenteth in anie point.

7. Martyr Epiſt. ad peregrinos in Anglia, tomo 2. loc. colum. 136. *we anſwer, that al Gods words, as they proceed from him, are of equal weight and authoritie; and therfore none maie of his*

Al Gods words of equal authoritie.

 Denial of anie point of faith iudgmēt receaue this, and reiect an other, as fals. Iames saieth boldly, who offendeth in one, is made guiltie of al. If that haue place in obedience to the commandements, it wil be true also for points of beleif. Caluin in Ephes. 4. v. 5. vpon that: *One God, one Faith*, writeth thus: *As often as thou readest the word, one, vnderstand it put emphatically, as if he saied: Christ cannot be deuided, faith cannot be parted.* Perkins in Explicat. Symboli colum. 512. *Thus indeed fareth the matter, that a man failing in one article, faileth and erreth in al. Wherupon faith is termed an entire copulatiue.* Spalatensis cōtra Suarem, c. 1. nu. 7. *Diuine faith perisheth wholy by the lest detraction, and consequently, it is no true Church, no not visible, in which entire faith is not kept in publik profession.* L. Canterb. p. 325. *There is but one sauing faith.* Item 338. And 342. *who hopes for saluation must beleue the Catholik faith whole and entire in euerie point.* P. 105. *Faith beleueth not onely the articles, but al the things rightly deduced from them.* Doctor Potter sec. 2. p. 41. commenderh Saint Basil

Faith is an entire copulatiue.

No Church, without entire faith.

for saying; *Not a syllable of diuine doctrin must be betraied:* And S. Gegorie Nazian. for saying: *One word, like a drop of poison, maie taint and corrupt faith.* And sec. 7. p. 74. insinuateth clearely, that not fundamental points *perteine to the vnitie of faith, though not primarily:* and pag. 73. that they are to be *beleued by a virtual, or general faith, and as it were a negatiue faith, wherby they are not to be denied or contradicted.* Whosoeuer therfore denie thē, being sufficiently proposed, haue no true sauing faith. The like he hath also p. 75. and (as I cited in the 3. Chapter n. 5.) doth oftentimes say, that it is fundamental to faith to beleue al that is sufficiently proposed, and that it is infidelitie to denie anie such point: whos words alloweth Chillingworth and addeth that not to beleue such points, is to giue God the Lie. And, that not fundamental points maie be so proposed, as the denial of them, wil draw after it, the denial of this fundamental truth. That al which God saies, is true. And if Not-fundamental points be

Al points sufficiently proposed are fundamētal to faith.

Sup c 3. n. 6.

fundamental to faith, when they are ſufficiently propoſed, how can ſauing faith be, and not beleue them? Seing nothing can be without al that is fundamental to it, as is euident by itſelfe, and confeſſed by Proteſtants before l. 1. c. 7. num. 5. Beſids they profes by Fundamental, to vnderſtand eſſential: and nothing can be without that, which is eſſential to it. And if it be infidelitie, and to giue God the Lie, to denie ſuch points, how can there be true ſauing faith, where ſuch points are denied? ſeing ſauing faith cannot ſtand, where infidelitie is, or the Lie giuen to God. And out of al that hath beene ſaid of faith it is euident, that there can be no ſauing faith, but that which actually beleueth not onely al fundamental points, but euen al points whatſoeuer of Gods reueled word ſufficiently propoſed: and virtually alſo, al points or partes of his word whatſoeuer: and that al other kinds of beleif, is true hereſie, and a ſpice of infidelitie.

Sup. l. 1. c. 7. n. 6, 7.

The errors of Proteſtants, touching the eſſence and vnitie of true faith, and true Church, confuted out of that vvhich hath beene ſaied.

FIFT CHAPTER.

1. OVt of that which hath been ſaied of the eſſence and the vnitie of true diuine faith, together with that, which shal be ſaied hereafter of the eſſence, and vnitie of the true Church of God, the errors of Proteſtants touching the eſſence and vnitie of true faith and Church, maie be eaſily, and clearely confuted.

2. Their firſt, and principal error, (out of which proceed the others) is, that there be certaine principal articles, which alone, *belong* (as D. Potter ſpeaketh, ſec. 5. p. 16.) *to the ſubſtance of faith.* Sec. 3. p. 60. *Cõprehend the life and ſubſtance of Religion.* Sec. 7. p. 74. *which*

Proteſtants put the eſſence, and vnitie, of faith and Church, in ſome points only.

essentially perteine to the faith, and properly constitute a Church. P. 78. *which make vp the Catholik faith.* And p. 102. *wherin consists the vnitie of faith, and of the Catholik Church.* Whervpon he saieth, sec. 2. p. 39. *Among wise men, each discord in Religion dissolues not the vnitie of faith.* And Lord Conterburie sec. 38. p. 355. saieth: That to err in Not fundamentals, is no breach vpon the one sauing faith. And p. 360. *In things not necessarie, though they be diuine truths also, Christian men maie differ, and yet preserue the one necessarie faith.* And Chillingworth c. 3. pag. 159. saieth there be certaine propositions or doctrins, *which integrate and make vp the bodie of Christian Religion.*

3. But this error, that the essence of sauing faith, and of the true Church of God, consisteth only in certaine principal points, and the substantial vnitie of them, is clearely confuted out of what hath been saied. For the total obiect of true sauing faith, is no parte only of Gods reuealed word, or

The total obiect of faith is al Gods reuealed word.

anie part only of Christs doctrin, but Gods whole reuealed word, Christs whole doctrin, as is euident by itselfe, and is proued before, and also confessed by Doctor Potter sect. 7. p. 71. and sec. 2. p. 39. where he alloweth the diuisiō of the obiect of faith made by Saint Thomas, *into primarie, and into Secundarie, as that Abraham had 2. Sonns.* And both he, and Chillingworth cited in the third chapter n. 5. 6. confes, that it is fundamental to faith, to beleue *Not fundamental* points sufficiently proposed, and so far fundamental, that to denie them, is infidelitie, and to giue God the Lie. But what is fundamental to faith, is essential to faith, as is euident by itself, and Protestants confessed aboue l. 1. c. 7. num. 5. And beside they confessed l. 1. c. 7. num. 6. and 7. That by fundamental, they meane Essential. And if Not fundamental sufficiently proposed, be essential to faith, fals it is, that the essence of saiing faith consisteth only in certaine principal articles. And if the essence of faith consist C. 4. n. 9.

Protestants by fundamental meane essentiall

not in them only, nether doth the vnitie of it conſiſt in them only; but whoſoeuer are deuided in anie points of faith ſufficiently propoſed, are deuided in the verie ſubſtance, and ſubſtantial vnitie of faith. And ſith the ſubſtance of faith, is but one, the one of the parties deuided, hath no true ſauing faith.

4. Their ſecond error, is: *That* (as Lord Canterburie ſaieth ſec. 39 p. 376. *The Proteſtant and the Roman Religion are the ſame.* Potter ſec. 3. p. 58. *Reformation did not change the ſubſtance of Religion.* So alſo white Defenſ. c. 38. For the ſubſtance of the Roman Religiō (as of al true Chriſtian Religion) is profeſſion of al Chriſts doctrin ſufficiently propoſed to vs, and eſſentially includeth Romish doctrin, as is euident by that Epitheton Roman. And the ſubſtance of the Proteſtant Religion, are only certaine principal articles of his doctrin. Therfore the ſubſtance of both of them is not the ſame. Beſids, who differ in not fundamentals ſufficiētly propoſed, differ

The ſubſtāce of Rom. Religion diffe-rent, from the ſubſtāce of Proteſtants.

See ſup. n. 2.

Perkins Gal 3. v. 9. Politicus, qui nullius eſt Religionis, dicit nos & Pontificias non differre in ſubſtātia.

in ſome eſſential point of faith, becaus (as is now rehearſed out of Proteſtats) ſuch points are fundamental to faith, and haue the formal obiect of faith which is diuine reuelation. But the Roman and Proteſtant Religion differ at leaſt in Not fundamental points ſufficiently propoſed; Therfore they differ in ſome eſſential points, and in ſome formal obiect of faith, and conſequently are not the ſame. And this Lord Canterburie ſeemeth to confes when p. 125. he ſaieth. *The time was, that you and we were al of one beleef.* As if now we were not. And p. 285. *There are no meane differences that are beetweene vs.*

5. The third error is, that they *haue not left the Church of Rome in her eſſence,* as ſpeaketh. Lord Canterburie ſec. 25. p. 192. Doctor Potter ſec. 3. p. 62. 66. and others commonly. For ſith they haue left the Church of Rome in profeſſion of ſome not fundamentals ſufficiently propoſed, they haue left her in her eſſence: becaus her eſſence includeth al points of faith

The eſſence of the Rom. and Proteſt. Church is different.

sufficiently proposed. And therefore who leaueth the Church of Rome in profession of some points of faith sufficiently proposed, leaueth her in her essence. Besids, Protestants saie (as is related l. 1. c. 6. num. 5.) That the Church of Rome erreth in fundamental points, holdeth errors of themselues damnable, hath corrupted faith in the principal points, is fallen into substantial corruptions: How then can they saie, They haue not left her in her essence? Since they saie, That she herself hath not the essence of the Church. Moreouer, seeing the Protestant Church differeth from the Roman in al the formal essential parts of a Church, to wit, in profession of faith, (and that in great matters, as in sacrifice, Sacraments, parte of Gods written word, and such like,) and in communion of Sacraments, and finally in officers of the Church, or ministers of the word and Sacraments, how can they think, that their Church differeth not in essence from ours, or that they haue

Protest. and Ro. Church differ in al the formal partes of a Church.

not left our Church in her essence, hauing left her in al her formal parts? Finally they haue left her in her communion of Sacraments, which is an essential part of her.

6. Their fourth error is, that they *haue not left the Church of Rome, but only her corruptiõs*; For thos points, are essential points of the Church of Rome, and held of her as such, becaus they are part of Gods reuealed word sufficiently proposed to her. *Chilling. p. 273. 132. L. Cant. p. 192.*

7. Their fift error is, that *they haue not left the Church of Rome anie farther, then she hath left herself*, to wit, in some points of faith. For if she had sinfully left herself in anie point of faith sufficiently proposed, she had left her owne essence, and so had destroied herself. And so Protestants must haue left her altogether, as she had left herself altogether, in destroing herself by going from some points of faith sufficiently proposed to her. *Potter sec. 1. p. 7.* *Change in faith is not reformation but a new formation of the Church.*

8. Their sixt error is, that there are some things, which *separate from*

the Church in parte only, and not ſimply, as ſaieth Lord Canterburie ſec. 10. p. 26. For if he meane (as he doth) of points of faith ſufficiently propoſed, nothing can ſeparate from the Church in part, but it ſeparateth ſimply. Becaus (as is often ſaied) euerie ſuch point, is of the eſſence of the Church, ſeparates ſimply from her. For (as Ariſtotle wel ſaieth) the eſſences of things conſiſt in indiuiſibili, and are like numbers, which are changed by anie addition or ſubſtraction, whatſoeuer. And it is the whole word of God, whoſe profeſſion is of the eſſence of the true Church, and therfore who ſeparates from a true Church in profeſſion of anie part of Gods word, ſeparates from her ſimply. And one thing it is, to ſeparate ſimply, or in part, from the word of God: an other: to ſeparare ſimply or in part, from the true Church of God. Heretiks ſeparate not ſimply from the word of God, becaus they beleiue ſome part of it. But they ſeparate themſelues ſimply from the true Church

What ſeparates frō the Church in part, ſeparates ſimply.

Who ſeparates from a part of gods word, ſeparates wholy from his Church.

Church of God, of whos eſſence it is, to profès the whole reuealed word of God. And Heretiks ſeparating from profeſſion of the whole word of God, ſeparate from this eſſence of the Church of God, and conſequently ſeparate ſimply from her. For to ſeparate from her eſſence, is to ſeparate from her, ſimply.

9. But al thes points wil be yet more cleare, by what we shal ſaie of the eſſence, and vnitie of the true Church of God. And both by what we haue ſaied of the eſſence and vnitie of true ſauing faith, and shal ſaie of the eſſence and vnitie of the true Church of God, it wil eaſily appeare to be true, what Ariſtotle ſaieth, that out of a true definition, al difficulties maie be ſolued, which ariſe about the thing defined. For if Proteſtãts would conſtantly agree with us (as ſometimes, being conuicted by euidencie of truth, they doe) that true ſauing faith, is eſſentially beleif of al Gods reuealed word, ſufficiently propoſed, they would neuer denie, but al and

A true definition ſolues al difficulties.

See ſup. c. 3. n. 5. 6.

what is true diuine faith

euerie part of Gods reuealed word ſufficiently propoſed, is eſſential to ſauing faith, and denial of anie part of ſuch word of God, is denial of ſauing faith; and that diuiſion in profeſſion of ſuch word of God, is a ſubſtantial diuiſion in faith. It wil alſo appeare, that al the errors of Proteſtants about the eſſence or vnitie of ſauing faith, or of the true Church of God, riſe of their Not knowing, or rather of their not conſtant obſeruing, the true definitions of ſauing faith, and of the true Church of God, which themſelues ſometimes giue. But being ſet betweene two oppoſites, to wit, true faith, and the Proteſtant faith; the true Church, and the Proteſtant Church, when they conſider the nature of true ſauing faith, and true Church, they agree with vs in defining or deſcribing them: But when they conſider the nature of the Proteſtant faith, and Church, they are faine to ſaie that, which is clearely refuted out of their owne definitiõs of true ſauing faith, and true Church.

Errors of Proteſtants about faith and Church, ariſe of not obſeruing their true definitions.

VVhat Proteſtants can not be conſtant in doctrin.

And ſo in effect recal their owne definitions of a true Church, or of ſauing faith, and therby quite alter the queſtion, and make the diſpute of quite different things. For whiles they defend the Proteſtant faith or Church, by the names of *faith* or *Church*, they meane quite other things, then Scripture, Fathers, we, or themſelues other whiles, doe. But it maie ſuffice to reaſonable men, louers of trut, hand not wranglers about words, that if by *faith*, Proteſtants wil meane, as Scripture, Fathers, we, and themſelues ſometimes, doe, they cannot ſaie, that the eſſence of it conſiſteth only in ſome principal points, but in al Gods reuealed word ſufficiently propoſed: nor the vnitie of ſauing faith, in vnitie of only ſome principal points, but in vnitie of beleuing al Gods words ſufficiētly propoſed, and that who differ in beleif of anie point of Gods word ſufficiētly propoſed, differ ſubſtātially in faith. And if by *Faith*, they wil meane ſome other thing, then Scripture, Fathers, we, and themſelues

Proteſtants in defeding their faith and Church, meane quite other things by Faith and Church.

Proteſtants equiuocate in the names of Faith and Church.

alſo ſometimes, doe, they maie if they wil; for words are ad placitum; But it shal not be true ſauing faith, (For that is that, wherof the Scripture, and Fathers meane) but a faith of their owne inuention, whos effence and vnitie they maie put in what points they pleaſe. And thus hauing proued, that voluntarie or ſinful denial of anie point of faith, or of Gods word reuealed, and ſufficiently propoſed to vs, deſtroieth both the ſubſtance, and vnitie of true ſauing faith: Now let vs shew, that it alſo deſtroieth the ſubſtance, and vnitie of Gods true Church.

That ſinful error, or error in anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed, deſtroieth the ſubſtance of a true Church.

SIXT CHAPTER.

1. ALbeit it be euident, by what we haue proued before, that ſinful error againſt anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed, deſtroieth the ſubſtance of a true Church, becaus al ſuch error is formal hereſie, and deſtroieth Catholik faith: And a true Church cannot be with hereſie, or without Catholik faith: Yet wil we proue it more particularly, out of the definitions or deſcriptions of a true Church, giuen by Scripture, Fathers, and Proteſtants themſelues, and laſtly by reaſon. *L. Canterb. ſec. 10. p. 36. what is ſubſtantial in faith, is ſubſtantial to the Church.*

2. The Scripture Acts 2. v. 42. deſcribing the true Church of Chriſt, ſaieth: *They were perſeuering in the doc-* *Deſcription of the Church by Scripture.*

trin of the Apostles, and communication of breaking bread, and praiers, In which words is cōteined a description of the true Church, euen by confession of Protestants. For thus Whitaker Controu. 2. q. 5. c. 19. *This place is surely notable, and thes words do shew, by what Notes the Apostolik Church was known and shewed. The first note, was the doctrin of the Apostles. For the Apostles deliuered that doctrin, which they receaued from Christ, the Christians of thos times embraced and perseuered in it, and it distinguished that companie of men from other companies and societies. For they alone then were the true Church, who perseuered in doctrin.* And Plessiel. de Eccles. c. 2. *Thes words of Scripture, are nothing but a description of the true Church of Christ, instructed in the truc faith of Christ by his word, and knit together in true loue by the Communion which is in him.* But they who beleue only fundamental points, and sinfully denie Not fundamental points of faith, de not absolutly perseuer in the doctrin of the Apostles. For *the doctrin of the Apostles*, is their

The doctrin of the Apostles, includeth al their doctrin.

whole doctrin, and includeth as wel Not fundamental, as fundamental points of faith. Who therfore perſeuer only in the fundamental points, and not in the vnfundamental, perſeuer only in a parte of the Apoſtles doctrin, and in parte leaue it, and cõſequently are not the true Church. Beſids, our Sauiour Ioan. 10. ſaieth: *My sheep, heare my voice.* But who heare his voice only in fundamental points, doe not abſolutly heare his voice, but in parte only, and in parte heare it not. For Chriſts voice, is as wel in Not fundamẽtal points of his doctrin, as in fũdamental. Therfore ſuch are not Chriſts. And Ioan. 8. *If ye abide in my word, ye shal be my diſciples indeed.* But they abide not in his word, who forſake it in al points not fundamental. Moreouer, ſinful errors in faith, are gates of hel. But gats of hel preuaile not againſt Chriſts true Church. Therfor not ſinful errors in faith. Beſids if the the Catholik Church, should ſinfully err in anie point of faith, she should not be holie men, nor a holie ſocietie.

For ſhe ſhould be a ſocietie in hereſie: and ſo that article of our Creed: *I beleue the holie Catholik Church*, ſhould be falſe.

3. And in like manner, the holie Fathers define the true Church, as is euident by their excluſion of al heretiks, and by this confeſſion of Moulins lib. 1. contra Peron cap. 2.

Deſcription of the Church by Fathers.

The antient Doctors are wont to vnderſtand by the Church (which oftentimes they cal Catholik) the whole ſocietie of Chriſtian Churches, Orthodox, and ſound in faith, vnited together in Communion: and they oppoſe this Church to the ſocieties of Schiſmatiks, and heretiks, which ſenſe (ſaieth he) *we wil not reiect.* But who ſinfully err in ſome points of faith ſufficiently propoſed, or for their fault not ſo propoſed, are not Orthodox nor ſound in faith. Therfore if we wil vnderſtand by the *Church*, what the Fathers did, we cannot ſaie, that ſuch are of the Church. And this is confirmed, becaus the true Church, which we beleue, is Catholik, as is profeſſed in the Apoſtles Creed: And *Catholik*,

by the Fathers iudgment, erreth not in anie point of faith. For thus Saint Auguſtin l. imperfec. in Geneſin c. 1. *The Church is called Catholik, becaus she is vniuerſally perfect, and halteth in nothing.* And Epiſtle 48. *Perhaps she is called Catholik, becaus she truly holdeth the whole, of which truth, ſome peeces are found in diuers hereſies.* The like hath Saint Cyril. Catecheſi 18. S. Optatus l. 1. Patianus Epiſt. 1. Vincet. c. 3. But who denie anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed, are not vniuerſally perfect, nor truly hold the whole, but halt in ſomething. Therfore they are not Catholiks, and conſequently not of the true Church. Hooker l. 5. p. 324. *Cyprian with the greateſt part of African Biſhops were of nothing more certainly perſuaded, then that heretiks are, as rotten branches, cut off from the life and bodie of the true Church.*

Catholik holdeth al.

4. And in the ſame manner doe Proteſtants ſometimes define the true Church. For thus Moulins l. 1. contra Peron c. 26. *That is the true Church, which is vnited together in profeſſion of*

Deſcription of the Church, by Proteſtants.

This definition (ſaieth he) *is receaued by our Aduerſaries.* Whence it followeth, *that the true Church is diſcerned by profeſſion of true faith.* And that he meaneth by *true faith*, entire true faith. I proue: Firſt, becaus parte of true faith, is not abſolutly true faith: but a parte there of. Secondly, becaus he ſaieth, Catholiks admit this definition, which they neuer admit, vnles by *true faith*, be meant entire true faith. Thirdly, becaus c. 28. he ſaieth. *The whole entire doctrin of ſaluation, is the Note of the Church.* Therfore when he defined the Church, by profeſſion of *true faith*, he meant entire true faith. And in the ſaied c. 26. he ſaieth. *The true Church is oppoſed to heretiks and Schiſmatiks.* And c. 25. *The queſtion* (which is the true Church) *is of the Orthodox Church, ioined in Communion, by what Notes she maie be diſcerned from heretiks, ſchiſmatiks, and idolaters.* Whatſoeuer Church therfore is heretical, or not orthodox, is no true Church.

Hiremias P. C. Reſp. 1 ad V Virtenb. Qui ſe non totos veritati dedidérunt, nè in Chriſti quidem Eccleſia ſunt.

Entire true doctrin is the Note of the Church.

Field l. 2. c. 2. Entire profeſſion of the truth reuealed by Chriſt diſtinguisheth right beleuers from heretiks.

5. And generally al Proteſtants,

put in their definitions of the true Church, *Pure, ſincere, entire, and incorrupt word of God.* The confeſſion of England ar. 19. *The viſible Church of Chriſt, is a Congregation, in which the pure word of God is preached.* The Swiſers Confeſſion c. 17. *In which is ſincere preaching of Gods word.* The French Confeſſion art 27. *In which is conſent in embracing pure Religion.* Beza Epiſt. 24. and Sadeel contra Turian. loco 1. *In which the doctrin of the Ghoſpel is purely deliuered.* And loco 30. *When I defined the viſible Church, conſiſting of al her parts, I ſaied, that puritie of doctrin, and true vſe of Sacraments, was eſſential to the Church.* Vrſinus in Catechiſ. q. 2. *In which the entire and vncorrupt doctrin of the Law and Goſpel is embraced.* Field l. 2. of the Church c. 2. *Entire profeſſion of thos ſupernatural verities which God hath reuealed in Chriſt, is eſſential and giueth being to the Church.* Fulk. Ioan. 14. not. 5. *The true Church of Chriſt can neuer fal vnto hereſie. It is an impudent ſlander to affirme, that we ſay, ſo.* The Magdeburgians Centur. 1. cap. 4. *In which, the*

The Church profeſſeth the pure, entire, an vncorrupt word of God.

Caluin 4. inſtit. c. 2 §. 3. vbi ad definitionem Eccleſiæ vētum eſt, haerent in ſuo luto.

Puritie of doctrin eſſētial to the Church.

Entire.

Iames Andrews li. contra Hosium p. 210. *In which the incorrupt word of God soundeth.* Whitaker contro. 2.q.5.c.17. *Sincere preaching of the word, and lawful vse of the Sacraments, make the Church: so as where they are not, the Church is not.* And c.18. *The Church is no other multitude, then which holdeth the pure preaching of the word.* Ibid. *It can not hold anie heretical doctrin, and yet be a Church.* Spalatensis l.7.de Repub. c.10. nu.26. *The forme of the Catholik Church, is the entire profession of Christs faith.* And c. 12. num.132. *To the true Church, two things only are required, to wit, entire faith in Christ, and peace and cōmunion with al that profes this faith.* Caluin in Ioan.10.v.1. *We must not communicate with anie other Societie, then that, which conspires in the pure faith of the Ghospel.* Besids, Protestants profes, *puritie in doctrin*, to be the essential Note of the Church, as Beza lib. de Notis Eccles. Whitaker controu. 2. q. 5. c. 17. Morton l. 2. Apolog. c. 41. Danæus contr. 4. p. 741. Riuet tract. 1. sec. 45. Luther

vncorrupt.

Forme of the Church, is entire profession of Christs faith.

in caput 2. Iſaiæ: In which confeſſions of Proteſtants we are to Note, how, when they intend to define the true Church, they put, *pure, ſincere, entire, and vncorrupt doctrin* in its definition, and ſaie, that ſuch doctrin is the eſſential Note of a true Church, and the forme therof. Alſo, how they denie anie companie to be a true Church, which hath not the pure word. But ſuch as ſinfully denie the not fundamental points of Gods word ſufficiently propoſed, profès not his pure, ſincere, entire, and vncorrupt word. Therfore they are not of the true Church.

6. To this, no other anſwer can be giuen, but that, when Proteſtants define the true Church, by *the pure, ſincere entire word of God*, or ſaie that ſuch is the eſſential Note, or forme of the Church, they meane only, pure, ſincere, entire, or vncorrupt, in fundamental poiuts of Gods word, not in al Gods word ſufficiently propoſed. But this euaſion in clearely refuted. Firſt becaus this condemneth their

Proteſt. can not anſwer without cõfeßion that they equiuocate.

definition of obscuritie or defect. Next becaus if they had only defined the Church to be a cõpanie, in which *the word of God*, or *the faith of Christ*, is professed, they could not haue expounded it, of anie parte of Gods word, or of Christs faith: becaus the *word of God*, *The faith of Christ*, signifie his whole word, his whole faith, as *the Church* signifieth the whole Church: And much les can they expound this definition, of profession of anie parte of Gods word, or of Christs faith, seing they haue added to the *word of God*, or *to the faith of Christ* those most significant adiectiues, *pure*, *sincere*, *entire*, *vncorrupt*. For what is the *pure*, *sincere*, *vncorrupt*, word of God, cannot be mixt with anie falsitie, or word of man. And what is the *entire word* of God, cannot be a parte only, but must needs be his whole word. Whosoeuer therfore sinfully, profès anie falsitie, or word of man, or not the whole reuealed word of God, are not the true Church. Secondly, becaus (as we proued before)

See c. 2. nu. 5. l. 1.

Protest. expound pure by impure. Entire by a parte.

What is pure, hath no mixture, and what entire, is no part.

c. 2. 4.

there are no fundamental points in the Proteſtants ſenſe, that is, ſuch as are ſufficient to be beleued, though other points of faith be ſufficiently propoſed: nor anie Not fundamental in their ſenſe, that is, ſuch as are not neceſſarie to be actually beleued, when they are ſufficiently propoſed, and virtually, though they be not propoſed. But al points of faith whatſoeuer, are fundamental or eſſential to a true Church, and are to be beleued, ether actually and explicitly, if they be ſufficiently propoſed, or (at the leaſt) virtually and implicitly, if they be not ſufficiently propoſed. For (as is ſaid before) the whole reuealed word (which conteineth as wel Not-fundamentals, as fundamentals) is the true obiect of faith. And no companie, but ſuch as profeſſeth al Chriſts doctrin, can be a true Church of Chriſt. And therfore none, who denie anie points of his doctrin ſufficiently propoſed, can be his true Church abſolutly, but only his Church in parte, as in parte onely

Field l. 2. de Eccleſia c. 3. freedom frō pertinatious error, is euer found in the true Church.

Fulks ouerthrow of the answer to Char Preface p. 114.

Al points of faith eſſential to a true Church.

they profès his doctrin. And this D. Potter insinuateth, when sec. 7. p. 74. he saieth; That Not fundamentals do *not primarily belong to the vnitie of faith, or to the essence of a Church, or to the saluation of a Christian.* For if they doe anie waie truly belong (whether primarily, or secondarily) to the essence of a Church, a Church cannot be without them altogether, becaus nothing can be without that which any way belongs to its essence. And they maie be saied to belong secundarily, to the essence of a Church, becaus a Church maie be without actual beleif of them, to wit, if they be not sufficiently proposed.

Not fundamentals belong to the essence of a Church.

See Chilling. p. 209. 291.

How Not-fundamentals may belong secundarily

7. Reason also conuinceth, that what is simply and absolutly a true Church of Christ, must, (at least virtually and implicitly) profès al his doctrin. Becaus if it doe no waie profès his whole doctrin, but only some parte of his doctrin, it is not simply and absolutly his Church, but in parte only his Church, and in parte not his Church; as in parte it professeth his

Al points of Christs doctrin howsoeuer must be professed at least virtually or implicitly.

his doctrin, and in part reiecteth it. And they, nether virtually nor implicitly profes his whole doctrin, who ſinfully reiect anie part of it, when it is ſufficiently propoſed to be his. Secondly, becaus to reiect anie parte of Chriſts doctrin ſufficiently propoſed to be his doctrin, is to reiect Chriſts veracitie: for it is as much as to ſaie, he is not to be beleued in that, and is an act of infidelitie, as Proteſtants before confeſſed. And how can they be a true Church of Chriſt, who in anie point reiect Chriſts veracitie, and commit an act of infidelitie. Beſids, as Lord Canterburie ſaieth, ſec. 10. p. 36. *whatſoeuer is fundamental in the faith, is fundamental to the Church, which is one by the vnitie of faith.* But *Not fundamental* points ſufficiently propoſed, are fundamental to faith, as before D. Potter and Chillingworth confeſſed. Therfore &c. C. 3. § 5. 6. l. 2. C. 3. § 5. 6. l. 2.

8. And out of thes definitions of a true Church, which we haue brought out of holie Scripture, Fathers, Proteſtants, and reaſon, it appeareth:

Firſt, how vntrue it is, which Canterburie, ſaieth ſec. 16. p. 62. *The Catholik Church, which wee beleue in our Creed, is the ſocietie of al Chriſtians:* or which Moulins ſaieth l. 1. cõtra Peron c. 2. *The Scripture taketh the name of the Church ſometimes, for the vniuerſal companie of al thoſe, who profes themſelues Chriſtians, and to beleue in Ieſus Chriſt.* Secondly, how, vntrue it is, which the ſame Lord Canterburie hath ſec. 36. p. 314. *No man can be ſaied ſimply to be out of the viſible Chureh, that is baptized, and holds the foundation.* Or ſec. 20. p. 129. *That Church, which receaues the Scripture as a rule of faith, and both the Sacraments, as ſeales of grace, can not but be a true Church in eſſence.* Or which D. Potter ſaieth ſec. 5. p. 18. *A true Church, is al one with a Church not erring in the foundation.* Or as Chillingworth ſaieth c. 5. p. 283. *Proteſtants grant their communion to al, who hold with them, not al things, but things neceſſarie.* Or, (which generally al Proteſtants ſaie:) That the Catholik Church, is the multitude of al Chriſtians through the whole

Catholik Church includeth not al Chriſtiãs.

Tertul. præſcrip. c. 41. hæretici pacẽ paſſim cum omnibus miſcent.

world, who agree in profeſſion of the principal articles of Chriſtian faith, howſoeuer they denie other points of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them, nor communicate together at al in Sacraments or publik worship of God. For, beſide that theſe things are ſaied without al apparent proof, ether of Scripture, Fathers, or reaſon, but merely to include themſelues and ſuch others as they pleaſe, within the bounds of the true Catholik Church, they are clearely conuinced out of the aforeſaid definitions of the Church, taken out of Scripture, Fathers, Proteſtants, and reaſon. For nether do al Chriſtians, or al that profès themſelues Chriſtians, perſeuer in the doctrin of the Apoſtles, but onely in a part of it: nor are they al Orthodox or ſound in faith, or vnited in communion: nor do they al profès the pure, ſincere, vncorrupt, and entire word of God: and therfore, according to the definitions of the true Church giuen by Scripture, Fathers, Proteſtants, and reaſon, they are

not al members of the true Church.

9. And with les apparence, can they be ſaied to be the Catholik Church. For *Catholik* (as before I ſaid out of Saint Auguſtin and other Fathers) halteth in nothing, and manie of thos Chriſtians, who hold the principal articles, halt in manie other points of faith. And beſids, al ſuch Chriſtians communicate not together, and cõdemn one an other, as is euident in the Roman the Grecian, the Lutheran the Caluiniſt, and ſuch other Churches: And communion, is as wel eſſential to the true Catholik Church, as puritie in faith, as hereafter shal be proued. Nay *Catholik* rather ſignifieth communion, then puritie in faith. What monſtrous Catholik Church then muſt that be, which conſiſteth of al thos Chriſtians, who agree only in the principal points of Chriſtian faith, but in al other points, how ſufficiently ſoeuer propoſed to them, diſagree, and condemn one an others beleif, and communion? Is ſuch a Chaos, or hydra, the Church inſtituted by

C. 6. n. 3. l. 2.

C. 13. S. Auſtin Epiſt. 48. l. de vnit. c. 6 Collat. 3. diei c. 3 de Paſtorib° c. 13. Field l. 3. de Eccleſ c. 43.

A monſtruous Church of Proteſtants.

Chriſt, the holie Church profeſſed in our Creed, the Spouſe of Chriſt, the howſe and Kingdom of God? Certainely a Church conſiſting of al Chriſtians, or of al that profes themſelues Chriſtians, or of al that hold the principal points of Chriſtian doctrin, but denie other points of his doctrin ſufficiẽtly propoſed to be his, and communicate not together in Sacraments, but condemn one an other, was neuer gathered or inſtituted by Chriſt, neuer mentioned by the Fathers, but is a mere Monſter of a Church, meerely feigned by ſome Proteſtãts, for to include themſelues, and ſinfully erring Chriſtians, within the pale of the Church. But we care not, whom they include in a Church of their owne inuention or making. It ſufficeth vs, that no ſuch, can be in the true Church of Chriſts making and which the Scripture, Fathers, reaſon, and Proteſtants alſo (when they only conſider the nature of the true Church) deſcribe and propoſe vnto vs. And that ſinfully to err in anie

Proteſtants equiuocate in the name of the Church.

point of Christs doctrin sufficiently proposed, destroieth the nature and substance of such a Church; which Protestants would neuer denie, if necessitie of defending sinfully erring Churches, did not force them to it.

Propertie of the vniuersal Church, not to err at al.

It is the propertie of the vniuersal Church onely, promised to her by Christ, not to err at al, ether voluntarily or involuntarily, ether vincibly or inuincibly, in anie thing which she professeth as matter of faith: but it is essential, both to the vniuersal, and to euerie particular true Church, not to err sinfully, voluntarily, or vincibly, in anie matter of faith whatsoeuer. So that, it implieth contradiction, to err in that manner, and yet to be a true Church substantially; And hauing thus proued that sinful error in anie point of faith, or of Christs doctrin sufficiently propoſed, destroieth the nature or substance of a true Church of Christ: Let vs also proue, that such error destroieth the true vnitie of a true Church.

Essential, not to err vincibly, or sinfully.

That ſinful error in anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed, deſtroieth the true vnitie of the Church of Chriſt.

SEAVENTH CHAPTER.

1. THat ſinful error in anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed, deſtroieth the true vnitie of Chriſts Church, followeth euidently out of what I haue before proued, that ſuch error deſtroieth the ſubſtance of his true Church. For if it deſtroie the ſubſtance of the true Church, it muſt needs deſtroie her vnitie, which floweth from her ſubſtance, and dependeth of it. But we wil proue it alſo in particular, out of Scripture, Fathers, reaſon, aud confeſſion alſo of Proteſtants.

2. Ar for holie Scripture, it not only abſolutly ſaieth, that the Church is one, but alſo, that it is ſo one, as thos

Cyprian. de vnit. Aug. tract. 6. in Ioan. Optatus l 1. & 2.

are, which are wholy one, and altogether vndeuided. Cantic. 6. v. 8. Christ saith: *My doue, is one.* Which place both Fathers teach; and Protestants confès, to be meant of the true Church. Ioan. 10. v. 16. Christ saieth of his Church: *There shal be made one flock, and one shepheard.* Rom. 12. v. 5. *we manie, are one bodie in Christ.* But a doue, a flock, a bodie, are wholy one vndeuided at al. Therfore such is the true Church of Christ. Besids, the Scripture calleth the Church, the Kingdom of God, and addeth Mat. 12. *that euerie Kingdom deuided it self, shal perish.* Wherfore seing the true Church cannot perish, it is not deuided in itself. But who are sinfully deuided in points of faith, are not wholy one, but truly manie, and deuided in themselues. And Ioan. 11. *Iesus should die, to gather into one the children of God that were dispersed.* The like is Ioan. 17. and Actor 2.

The true Church is absolutly one.

Perkins in Symbal VVitak. Cont. 2. q. 1. c. 9.

Galat. 3. v. 28. omnes vos vnum estis in Christo.

Not deuided.

3. The holie Fathers also teach, that the true Church is wholy one and vndeuided in points of faith. Saint

Cyprian lib. de vnitate ſaieth : *The Church, is people ioined together in ſolid vnitie of a bodie, by the glue of concord,* and addeth, *vnitie cannot be cut, nor anie bodie ſeparated by diuiſion of ioints.* But ſolid vnitie of a bodie, and ſuch, as cannot be cut or deuided, is perfect and entire vnitie.

One in ſolid vnitie.

4. Saint Auguſtin in Pſal. 54. after he had recounted manie things, in which the Donatiſts were one with the Catholik Church, addeth : *They were there with me, but not wholy with me, in manie things with me, in few, not with me. But by thes few, in which they are not with me, the manie, in which they are with me, profit them not.* Lo how he exacteth, that men muſt be *wholy one* with the Catholik Church, and profeſſeth, that it profits them nothing, to be with her in manie matters, if they be not in al. And yet the Donatiſts (whorof he ſpeaketh) were with Catholiks in fundamẽtal points, as appeareth by thes his words Epiſt. 48. *Yee are with vs in baptiſme, in the Creed, in the reſt of Gods Sacraments : in*

The Church is wholy one.

Not in parte only.

Donatiſts were one in the creed and Sacraments. Sic etiã Optatus l. 3. & 5.

Spirit of vnitie, in bond of peace, finaly in the verie Catholik Church, ye are not with vs. And lib. 1. de Baptismo c. 8. and 13. saieth. That an heretik, *is in parte ioined to the Church.* And yet no heretik is truly in the Church. Saint Optatus also lib. 4. saieth of the same Donatists: *Ye see, that we are not wholy separated one from the other.* So that by the iudgment of the Fathers, it is not enough, to be in parte ioined to her. See S. Leo epist. 4. c. 2.

L. 1. Catholicus non es foris estis In Catholica non estis l. 3. pars vestra, Catholica non est.

The Church is one.

Prater vnã altera non est.

One only.

Not manie.

Cannot be deuided.

5. Hereupon the Fathers saie, The Church is one. So the Nicen Creed, Saint Cyprian Epist. 46. and 64. S. Optatus lib. 1. & 2. Saint Augustin de vnitate c. 2. lib. 1. contra Cresc on c. 29. and others cõmonly. Sometimes they saie: She is *one only*. So Saint Augustin lib. 3. contra Petilian. c. 5. and epistle 120. Saint Hilarie l. 7. de Trinitate. Sometimes, she is *not manie*: So Optatus lib. 1. S. Augustin lib. de vnitate c. 16. and in collat. 3. diei c. 10. Sometimes, that *she cannot be deuided*. So Saint Cyprian epist. 47. and Saint Hierom in Psal. 51. And out of

this whole and entire vnitie of the Church, Saint Cyprian epiſt. 76. inferreth: *If the Church be with Nouatian it was not with Cornelius.* And yet Nouatian was not deuided from Cornelius in fundamẽtal or principal points. For thus Doctor Potter ſec. 4. p. 127. *The error of Nouatian was not it itſelf heretical, eſpecially in the proper and moſt heauie ſenſe of that word.* Saint Auguſtin alſo lib. 18. de ciuit Dei c. 51. *The Diuel raiſed heretiks, who vnder Chriſtian name, should reſiſt Chriſtian doctrin, as if they might be permitted in the cittie of God without correption, as the cittie of confuſion had indifferently philoſophers, thinking both different and contrarie things: who therfore in Chriſts Church haue anie vnſound and naughtie opinion, if being corrected for to beleue aright do obſtinatly reſiſt, and wil not amend their peſtiferous opinions, but perſiſt, to defend them, become heretiks, and going out, are held for exerciſing enimies.* Lib. de hæreſ. after he had reckoned manie hereſies, ſaieth: *whoſoeuer shal hold anie one of them, shal be*

The Church can not haue men of contrarie beleifs.

Note.

 And yet diuers of them are not againſt anie fundamental or principal point of faith: And l. 2. ad Gaudent. c. 11. *If ours be Religion, ſours is ſuperſtition.* And epiſtle ad Donatiſtas poſt Collat. and epiſtle 152. *If our Church be true, yours is falſe.* Al which ſayings, and inferences of the Fathers, were falſe, if the Church could be ſinfully deuided in points of faith. For being ſo deuided, she were not abſolutly *one*, nor *one only*, nor *Not manie*: but truly not one, and truly manie: nether would it follow, that if the Church were with thos who denie the Not fundamentals, that it were not with them, who beleue them: nor that, whoſoeuer hold anie of the hereſies related by S. Auguſtin, were no Cath. Chriſtians, as is euident.

6. Reaſon alſo conuinceth the ſame: For the true Church of Chriſt is a ſocietie in profeſſion of the faith or doctrin of Chriſt. But *the faith or doctrin of Chriſt*, ſignifieth his whole faith and doctrin. Ther-

fore the Church is a Societie in profeſſion of Chriſts whole doctrin. But where there is profeſſion of Chriſts whole doctrin, there can be no diuiſion in his doctrin. Nether durſt euer anie Proteſtant yet, define the Church to be a ſocietie in profeſſion of anie parte of his doctrin. For the name *of a parte of Chriſts doctrin*, sheweth, that it is not abſolutely Chriſts Church, but in parte only. Beſids, the Church (before defined of Proteſtants) is a *Societie in profeſſion of Chriſts pure, ſincere, vncorrupt, and entire doctrin.* But where there is vnion in profeſſion of Chriſts pure, and entire doctrin, there can be no diuiſion at al in doctrin. For his *pure doctrin*, excludeth al mixture of doctrin: and his *entire doctrin*, includeth al his whole doctrin. And if Proteſtants wil conſtantly ſtand to their foreſaied definitions, it is impoſſible for them to imagin, anie ſinful diuiſion in the true Church, in points of Chriſts doctrin.

None dare define the Church, by profeſſion of part of Chriſts doctrin.

C. 6. n. 5. l. 2.

7, If anie obiect, that hence it would follow, that a particular Church

or person, erring inuincibly in some point of faith, is no true Church, or true member of the Church, becaus they agree not with the Church in profession of the whole doctrin of Christ: I answer, what Church or person inuincibly erreth in some secundarie point of faith, doth virtually or implicitly beleue that verie truth, against which he erreth: becaus he explicitly beleueth the Catholik Church, which teacheth that truth. And implicit beleif of secundarie points not sufficiently proposed, sufficeth to a true particular Church, and to a true member of the Church. Hervpon Doctor Potter sec. 7. p. 75. saieth: *By virtual faith, an erring person maie beleue the truth contrarie to his owne error, in as much as he yeelds his assent implicitly to that Scripture, which conteines the truth, and ouerthrowes his error, though yet he vnderstand it not,* And Chillingworth in Answer to the Preface p. 18. *They beleue implicitly thos verie truths, against which they err.* But this is not true of such Churches or

who inuincibly err in not fundamentals virtually and implicitly beleue them.

But who vincibly err, doe not virtually beleue.

perſons, who ſinfully err againſt anie points ſufficiently propoſed: and therfore they are not at al ether explicitly, or implicitly vnited or ſociated in the profeſſion of Chriſts entire doctrin. And conſequently are not of his true Church, which is a ſocietie in profeſſion (ether explicitly, or implicitly) of his whole doctrin. C.5.n.7.l.2.

8. And this argument is confirmed, by what before we shewed, that the faith or doctrin of Chriſt, is an indiuiſible Copulatiue: And therfore al the points of it muſt be profeſſed, or it is not profeſſed. For an indiuiſible, muſt be al had, or none. And who profeſſeth only ſome parte of Chriſts doctrin, doth not profès the doctrin of Chriſt, but ſome parte, and no parte is the whole. And as they profès but ſome parte of his doctrin, and not the whole, ſo they are but in parte Chriſtians, and indeed not Chriſtians. For a whole or entire Chriſtian profeſſeth Chriſts doctrin wholy and entirely: and who profeſſeth it but in parte, and in parte reiecteth it, (as do

Heretiks but in part, Chriſtians.

they, who reiect anie point of his doctrin ſufficiently propoſed) is but in parte a Chriſtian, and indeed no Chriſtian. And hence it is, that holie Fathers ſaie that heretiks are no Chriſtians, as indeed they are not, if by Chriſtians, we meane, not men Chriſtened, but followers of Chriſts doctrin. For they follow not Chriſts doctrin, but only ſome parte of it, and reiect the reſt. Moreouer, Churches voluntarily differing in profeſſion of Chriſts faith or doctrin, differ in the eſſence of the Church, and conſequently eſſentially. For profeſſion of Chriſts faith or doctrin, is of the eſſence of his Church, and as ſuch, is put of al men in the definition therof. But Churches, wherof one profeſſeth al points of Chriſts doctrin, fundamental and Not fundamental, and the other, profeſſeth only fundamentals, and ſinfully reiecteth Not-fundamentals (though they be ſufficiently propoſed) differ in profeſſion of Chriſts doctrin. For his doctrin includeth as wel Not fundamentals, as fun-

what Churches differ in profeſsion of faith, differ eſſentially.

as fundamentals: they being equally reuealed by him, and equally propoſed to vs, as I ſuppoſe. Therfore the one of thes, is no true Church. For Chriſt hath not two Churches eſſentially differing.

9. Laſtly I proue, that vnitie in onely fundamental points of faith, is not ſufficient to the vnitie of the Church. For then the certaine vnitie of the Church could not be known, as Proteſtants profès they know not the certaine number of fundamental points: nor giue anie certaine mark, to know which are they. And ſo we could not be certaine, who were of the Church, who not, with whom we maie communicate, with whom not: as we cannot know certainely, which are the fundamental points, which are not: Seing we can nether haue a Catalogue of them, nor anie certaine mark to know them. But Catholiks, who meaſure not the vnitie of the Church, by fundamental points only, but by beleif of al points of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them, clearely ſee, who

Catholiks know who are of their Church: and Proteſtants, not.

are of the true Church who are not, and with whom they maie communicate, with whom not.

Proteſtants ſometimes confes the vnitie of the Church in matters of faith, to be entire.

10. Proteſtants alſo ſometimes confès, that the true Church is wholy one, and vndeuided in profeſſion of faith. For firſt they ſaie ſimply and abſolutly, that the Church *is one*: So the confeſſion of Auſpurg art. 7. The Apologie of the Church of England, and Proteſtants generally. Alſo, that it is *one only*: So confeſſio Heluetica c. 17. Belgica art. 27. Perkins vpon the Creed art. de Eccleſ. Iames Reſponſ. ad Peron p. 384. Beza de pun. hæret. p. 25. Sadeel præfat. ad artic. Abiurat. likewiſe, that the Church is *not manie*: Luther l. contra Papatum tom. 7. p. 461. *Chriſt knoweth not two kinds of vnlike Churches, but one only Church.* Melancton in Hoſpin parte 2. hiſt. fol. 81. *we ſpake sharply to them in this point, that we maruailed, with what conſcience, they* (Sacramentaries) *could hold vs for Brethren, whom they thought to err in doctrin.* And fol. 82. *Luther ſpake grauely to them, ſaying: he*

The Church is one.

One onely.

Not manie.

much maruailed, how they could haue him for a brother, if they thought their doctrin true. Caluin 4. inſtit. c. 1. paragr. 4. *we cannot haue two or three Churches, but Chriſt muſt be deuided.* See him Ioan. 10. v. 17. Muſculus loco de Eccleſ. ſec. 2. *The true Church of Chriſt, is not manifold, but one only.* And Whitaker controuer. 2. q. 1. c. 10. taketh it ſo il, that we should ſaie, They put two Churches, as he ſaieth; *It is a mere ſlaunder.* And ibid. q. 3. c. 3. auoucheth: *That it is impoßible, the Church should conſiſt of them, who profeſs cõtrarie faiths.* Serauia de gradibus Miniſtrorum c. 2. *The Church is one, which cannot be cut or deuided.* Lord Canterburie ſec. 35. p. 284. *Tis true, There is but one true faith, and but one true Church.* Ib p. 310. *It is as neceſſarie to beleue one God our father, as one Church our Mother,* P. 366. *There is but one Baptiſme, as we las but one Church.* Sec. 23. p. 147. *Chriſt gaue his natural bodie to be rent and torne vpon the Cros, that his myſtical bodie might be one.* Chillingworth in Anſwer to the preface p. 7. *D. Potter tels him:*

The Church can not be deuided.

Elien. in Tortura p. 398. Eccleſia vnum corpus.

His labour is loſt, in prouing the vnitie of the Catholik Church, wherof there is no doubt or controuerſie. D. Potter ſec. 2. p. 22. *No Proteſtant denies the Catholik Church to be one.* Confeſſio Heluet. c. 17. *The Church is not deuided or ſeuered in itſelf.* But how can thos Churches be ſimply aud abſolutly ſaied to be *one, only one, not manie, not two or three, not deuided,* which are not one, are manie, are deuided in profeſſion of points of faith ſufficiently propoſed? Doth not want of vnitie, or diuiſion in profeſſion of ſuch points, make want of vnitie, or ſubſtantial diuiſion in Churches? Why ſhould Luther or Melancthon maruaile, that Sacramentaries would account them brethren, and yet condemn their doctrin, if men holding obſtinatly falſe doctrin, maie be brethren of the ſame Church?

Vnitie in ſome points, is but vnitie, ſecundũ quid, and is true multiplicitie.

11. Moreouer, ſometimes they confeſs, that diuiſion in faith or Religiõ, is a certaine note of a falſe Church. Spalatenſis lib. 7. de Repub. c. 10. nu. 63. *Negatiuely, this Note* (of vnitie)

Diuiſion in Religion, is a Note of a falſe Church

hath ful force. For if this vnitie (in faith) *be anie waie wanting, the true forme of a true Church wil be wanting.* Alsted l. de Notis Eccles. c. 10. *Dissention in Religion, is a certaine Note of a false and Anti-Christian Church.* Wesphalus in Caluin in consens. de re Sacramentaria p. 756. *It is proper to heretiks, to disagree:* to which Caluin: *Be it so; what is that to vs?* But where is want of vnitie in not fundamental points of faith, there is want of vnitie in faith, and where there is dissention in Not fundamental points, there is dissention in Religion. For Not fundamental points, are points of faith and Religion, as is before proued. Therfore want of vnitie, or dissention in them, is a certaine signe of a false Church. L. 2. c. 1.

12. Furthermore, sometimes they teach absolutly (without making distinction of heresie in fundamental or Not fundamental points) that heresie is a departure from the Church, and that heretiks are out of the Church. Apologie of the Church of England *Al heretiks are out of the Church.*

parte 1. *Hereſie is a departure from the Bodie and Spirit of Chriſt.* Whitaker controu. 2. qu. 1. cap. 12. *No heretiks, though ſecret, belong to the Church of God.* Item. *An heretik cannot be a member of the Church.* Ibid. c. 4. *That* (Bellarmin) *proueth, heretiks Apoſtataes, and Schiſmatiks, not to be members of the true Church, maketh not againſt vs. For none of vs euer ſaied ſo.* And q. 5. c. 18. *It cannot hold an heretical opinion, and yet be a Church.* And c. 6. *It is falſe, that heretical and ſchiſmatical Churches, are true Churches.* Morton lib. 1. Apolog. c. 3. *Heretiks are not truly, but in name only, of the Church: not indeed, but equiuocally.* Moulins l. b. 1. contra Peron c. 26. *The true Church is oppoſit to heretiks and Schiſmatiks.* Sutcliff l. 1. de Eccleſ. c. 16. *No ſocietie of heretiks doth deſerue the name of a Church.* And yet (as we proued before) al are heretiks, who obſtinatly denie anie point of Chriſts faith ſufficiently propoſed. Therfore voluntarie breach, in anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed, deſtroieth the vnitie of the true Church.

c. 2. l. 2.

13. King Iames alſo Reſponſ. ad Peron p. 388. *Durſt one, but lightly corrupt the faith approued through the world? It was eaſie for a Child to diſcouer the new Maſter by his Noueltie. And the Theef of truth being found, al the paſtors of the whole world, if need were, were moued, and being moued, did not reſt, til they had remoued the il, and prouided for the ſecuritie of the sheep of Chriſt.* Lo, how the Church would not ſuffer anie, who, euen but lightly, corrupted Chriſts faith. And ibid. p. 385. *He knowes, that the ſupreame law in the howſe of God, is puritie of heauenly doctrin.* And if this be the ſupreme law in Gods howſe, none that teacheth impure doctrin, is to be ſuffered in Gods howſe.

The Church wil ſuffer no light corruption in faith.

Puritie of doctrin, ſupreme law in the Church.

14. And out of that which we haue proued here, and before, appeareth how fals the compariſon is, which Proteſtants cõmonly make betweene hereſie and ſicknes; and betweene ingritie of faith, and health in men. For health and ſicknes are accidents to men, and thoſe alſo ſeparable from

See c. 2. l. 1.

Integritie of faith is like life, and hereſie, like death.

them: wheras integritie in faith is eſſential to the Church, and hereſie, deſtructiue of its eſſence, as is euident out of their owne definitions of the
C.6.n.5. Church before related. And therfore they thould rather compare integritie in faith to life, and hereſie, to mans death. Secondly, how vntruly they teach, that diuiſion in points Not-fundamental (if they be ſufficiently propoſed) deſtroieth not the vnitie of the Church. For ſuch diuiſion is quite oppoſit to the vnitie of the true Church,
C.7. which (as hath been clearly proued) conſiſteth in actual, and explicit vnitie of profeſſing al points of faith ſufficiently propoſed, and in virtual, or implicit vnitie of profeſſing al whatſoeuer Chriſt taught. Thus haue we proued, that ſinful denial of anie point of Chriſts faith, deſtroieth ſauing faith, Church, and ſaluation. Now let vs proue, that it deſtroieth alſo Chriſts veracitie.

That not to beleue, or disbeleue anie point of Christs doctrin, sufficiently proposed, is to denie his veracitie, and consequently his deitie.

EIGHT CHAPTER.

1. THat to denie Christs veracitie in anie point, is to denie his Deitie, is euident, For he cannot be God, or *Prima Veritas*, The first veritie, who in anie point can deceaue, or be deceaued. And that to denie anie point of his doctrin sufficiently proposed, is to denie his veracitie in that point, is also euident out of that which before we said of faith. For, as to beleue or profès anie point of his doctrin for his authoritie sufficiently proposed, is implicitly to beleue or profès his veracitie therin: so not beleue anie point of his doctrin for his authoritie sufficiently proposed, is implicitly to denie his veracitie therin.

For as beleif and disbeleif are oppoſit acts, the one affirming, the other denying: ſo what, beleif implicitly affirmeth, disbeleif, implicitly denieth. If therfore beleif of a thing for Chriſts authoritie ſufficiently propoſed, implicitly profeſſeth his veracitie therin: Not beleif of the ſame for his authoritie ſufficiently propoſed, implicitly denieth his veracitie in that point. Beſids, diuine veracitie being the formal obiect of diuine faith, as long as that remaineth, and is no waie remoued, diuine faith remaineth. Therfore what taketh awaie diuine faith in one point, muſt needs take awaie diuine veracitie in that point. But Chriſts veracitie maie be denied in two manners. Firſt, explicitly and directly, and ſo it is denied by Iewes, Turks, and Infidels, who profès not to beleue in Chriſt. Secondly, implicitly and indirectly, and ſo it is denied by al heretiks, who though they explicitly and directly profès Chriſts veracitie, yet in not beleuing al which he taught, though it be ſufficiently

Sup. c. 4. n. 3.

So S. Tho. 22. q. 11. art. 1.

Beza de puniend. haret. p. 99. Chriſti doctrinã reijciẽdo Chriſtum ipſum repudiant p. 105. haretici Chriſti nomen nõ profitentur.

propoſed to them as taught by him, implicitly and indirectly denie his diuine veracitie. For who denieth that to be true, which one hath reported, and is ſufficiently propoſed as from him, implicitly and indirectly denieth that mans veracitie. For directly to denie the veracitie of the report, though it be ſufficiently propoſed as from the reporter, is indirectly to denie the veracitie of the reporter: Nether can anie Iuditious man conceaue the contrarie. Who therfore ſinfully denie the truth of anie point of Chriſts doctrin, ſufficiently propoſed for his, indirectly denie Chriſts veracitie.

2. Moreouer of two points equally taught by Chriſt, and equally propoſed to vs, as from him, it is impoſſible to beleue for Chriſts authoritie, the one, and not both: becaus Chriſts authoritie is equally in both, and where is equally the ſame motiue of beleif, there muſt needs equally be the ſame beleif, wherfore if we beleue not them both, we beleue

Chillingw. c. 3. p. 138. Gods reuelation is an equal motiue to induce vs to beleue al obiects reuealed by him.

nether for Christs authoritie, but for some other motiue humane. Againe, not to beleue Christs authoritie sufficiently proposed, to be a sufficient and iust Motiue to beleiue euerie thing taught by him, is to denie his veracitie: But they who beleue not euerie thing taught by him, and sufficiently proposed to themas from him, do so. Therfore they denie his veracitie. The Maior is euident: the Minor I proue: For not to beleue euerie thing that Christ taught, and is sufficiently proued to haue been taught by Christ, is implicitly to denie his authoritie sufficiently proposed, to be a sufficient and iust motiue to beleue whatsoeuer he taught. And surely to denie Christs authoritie sufficiently proposed, to be a iust and sufficient motiue to beleue, is to denie his veracitie to be sufficient for beleif.

Tertul. l. de carne Christi, vt quid dimidiatis mendatio Christum, totus veritas est.

3. Hereupon rightly said S. Augustin to the Manichees: *You who in Scriptures beleue what you list, and what you list not, beleue not Scriptures, but yourselues.* And so I saie, who in points

L. 17. cont. Faust. c. 3.

of Chriſts doctrin, equally taught by him, and equally propoſed to them, beleue what ſeemes true to them, and what ſeemes not true to them, beleue not, beleue not Chriſt, but themſelues. For if they beleued ether for Chriſts authoritie, they would equally beleue both, becaus his authoritie is equal to both. But becaus the motiue of their beleif, is ſeeming truth, and ſeeming truth is to them more in one, then in the other, they beleue the one, and not the other. And to this purpos Chillingworth in Anſwer to the Preface p. 23. ſaid. *He that doth not beleue al the vndoubted parts of the vndoubted books of Scripture, can hardly beleue anie: nether haue we reaſon to beleue he doth.* And he might haue ſaid ſo of al points of Chriſts doctrin ſufficiently propoſed, that who beleueth not them al, beleueth none, to wit, with diuine faith and for Chriſts authoritie: becaus this is equal in al ſuch points, and therfore if it effectually work diuine faith for one point, it wil work the ſame for al. Wherfore thus I argue.

Where is equally the total cauſe of diuine beleif, there is equally diuine beleif. In al points of Chriſts doctrin equally taught of him, and equally propoſed to vs, equally is the total cauſe of diuine beleif. Therfore in them al is equally diuine beleif. The Maior is euident. The Minor is cleare. For the total motiue cauſe of diuine beleif, is Chriſts authoritie, and that is equally in al points of his doctrin, which haue been equally taught by him, and are equally propoſed to vs, whether they be principal points, or ſecondarie.

4. Finally, what it oppoſit to faith, is Infidelitie. Denial of anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed, is oppoſit to faith. Therfore it is infidelitie. The Maior is euident, and the Minor proued l. 2. c. 4. But infidelitie denieth Chriſts veracitie, ether directly, as in thos, who profès not to beleue in Chriſt: or indirectly, as in thos, who beleue not what he clearely taught, and is ſufficiently propoſed to them for his doctrin. Beſids, he that denieth

ſome or al the fundamental points of Chriſts doctrin ſufficiently propoſed to him, denieth Chriſts veracitie, and hath not ſauing faith. And why not he alſo, who denieth ſome or al Not fundamental points of his doctrin ſufficiently propoſed? ſeeing Chriſts authoritie as equally teſtifieth thes, as thos. Why is not his authoritie equally denied in al points, which he equally teſtifieth? What doth the greatnes of the matter, ad to the greatnes of Chriſts authoritie? or what doth the ſmallnes of the matter, diminish of his authoritie? ſeeing it is not the greatnes of the matter, for which we ought to beleue it, but merely Chriſts authoritie.

5. This alſo is confirmed out of what we related, out of the holie Fathers, that al, who denie anie point of Chriſts faith ſufficiently propoſed, are heretiks: and that al heretiks, are no Chriſtians, haue no faith, but are infidels. For ſurely, whoſoeuer are no Chriſtians, haue no faith, and are infidels, doe in effect and (at the leaſt)

implicitly and indirectly denie Christs veracitie. And Protestants add here to (as we shewed before c. 4.) that Heretiks are Apostataes, Anti Christs, and Diuels: and surely such) at least in effect and indirectly) denie Christs veracitie. Moreouer S. Augustin (as we rehearsed before) affirmeth, that Christ is in name only with anie heretiks. And so heretiks profès Christ in name only, and in effect denie his veracitie.

6. And this truth is so manifest, as Protestants sometimes confès it. For thus Doctor Potter sec. 7. p. 74. *It is true, whatsoeuer is reuealed in Scripture, or propounded by the Church out of Scripture, is in some sense fundamental, in regard of the diuine authoritie of God and his word, by which it is recommended; that is, such, as maie not be denied or contradicted without infidelitie.* Lo, that to denie whatsoeuer is reuealed in Scripture, or propounded by the Church out of Scripture, is fundamental to faith: so that faith cannot be without beleif of euerie such thing, becaus

What is sufficiently proposed is fundamental to faith.

And it is infidelitie to denie it.

becaus faith cannot be without al that, which is fundamental to it: And alſo, that it is infidelitie to denie anie ſuch thing, and infidelitie denieth diuine veracitie. Chillingworth alſo in Anſwer to the Preface p. 11. *For a man to denie or disbeleue anie point of faith ſufficiently preſented to his vnderſtandings as a truth reuealed by God, is to giue God the lie.* And to giue God the lie, ſurely is to denie his veracitie. By which is refuted what he ſaith c. 3. p. 135 *without anie the leſt dishonor to Gods veracitie, I maie doubt of, or denie ſome truth reuealed by him, If I nether know, nor beleue it to be reuealed by him.* And p. 136. *He only, in fact affirmes, that God doth deceaue or is deceaued, who denies ſome things, which himſelf knowes or beleues to be reuealed by God.* which he oftentimes repeateth. For if to denie or disbeleue anie point of faith ſufficiently preſented to his vnderſtanding as a truth reuealed by God, be to giue God the lie, he dishonoreth Gods veracitie, and in effect affirmes that he doth deceaue, or is deceaued,

And to giue God the lie.

who denieth or disbeleueth a point of faith ſufficiently preſented in his vnderſtanding, as a truth reuealed by God, though he nether know, nor beleue it to be reuealed by God. For merely to denie or disbeleue a point of faith ſufficiently preſented to his vnderſtanding, is (as he ſaid truly) to giue God the lie, whether he know or beleue it to be reuealed by God, or no. And otherwiſe affected ignorãce, that God hath reuealed a point, which is ſufficiently preſented or propoſed to our vnderſtanding as reuealed by God, ſhould be no dishonour to Gods veracitie, nor a giuing the lie in effect to him. And hence it is euident, that albeit onely the principal points of Gods reuealed word be ſo in the couenant betweene him and men, as it is neceſſarie in al ordinarie courſe to be actually beleued of al, that can ſo beleue: yet Gods whole reuealed word is ſo included in the ſame couenant, as it is alſo neceſſarie to be beleued at leaſt virtually, becaus who doth nether actually nor virtually beleue

his whole reuealed word, doth not beleue him to be the prime veritie, or true in al his words: And ſurely they doe nether actually nor virtually beleue al Gods reuealed word, who wil not beleue ſome parte of it, when it is ſufficiently propoſed to them for Gods word.

7. And out of al that hitherto I haue ſaid, it appeareth (I hope) ſufficiently, that to teach, that ſome points of Chriſtian faith are not neceſſarie to ſauing faith, to a member of Chriſts Church, and to ſaluation; to be actually beleued, when they are ſufficiently propoſed, and virtually and in purpoſe of minde, whether they be propoſed or no, is damnably to deceaue ſoules, is to excuſe manie damnable hereſies from damnable ſin, is to introduce an indifference or libertiniſme in Chriſtian Religion, for beleuing or not beleuing the moſt points of Chriſtian faith, is to deſtroie the verie ſubſtance and vnitie of Chriſtian faith, is to deſtroie the ſubſtance and vnitie of Chriſts

Church, and to deſtroie Gods veracitie, to introduce infidelitie, the giuing of the lie to God, and atheiſme. Now wil I alſo ſhew, that to communicate in Sacraments and publik Liturgie, with anie ſuch as ſinfully err in anie point of Chriſtian faith, is damnable, and that to defend ſuch commnnion to be lawful, is damnably to deceaue ſoules.

THAT COMMVNION *in Sacraments vvith anie heretical Church, or Church erring ſinfully in anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed, is damnable.*

NINTH CHAPTER.

1. ONE great motiue for Proteſtants to teach, that there are ſome *Not fundamental* points of faith in their ſenſe, that is, not at al neceſſarie to a true Church, is to mainteine their communion in Sacraments and Liturgie with Churches ~~and~~ ſinfully erring in ſome points of faith ſufficiently propoſed, or for their fault, not ſo propoſed to them. For though perhaps euerie Proteſtant wil not confès himſelf to err in anie point of faith, yet they confés (as we haue ſeene

before lib. 1. c. 2. nu. 10.) that euerie one of their Churches, erreth in ſome points of faith. And if they ſaie, thos errors haue not been ſufficiently shewed to their Churches, they condemn themſelues of great negligence of their dutie, of want of ſufficient zeale of Gods honour, and of his truth, and of want of charitie to their Churches. At leaſt their Churches might be rightly informed, if they would, and therfore doe err ſinfully and vincibly. To thes therfore I wil proue, that their communion with a Church ſinfully erring in points of faith, is damnable.

2. And firſt, I proue it out of Scripture. S. Paul Tit. 3. v. 10. *An heretik, after the firſt and ſecond admonition, auoid.* 2. Theſſal 3. v. 6. *we denounce vnto ye, brethren, in the name of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, that ye withdraw yourſelues from euerie brother walking inordinatly, and not according to the tradition which they haue receaued from vs.* Rom. 16. v. 17. *I deſire ye brethren, to mark them, that make diſſentions and*

Heretiks to be auoided.

VVho walk not according to tradition.

VVho make diſſentiõs in doctrin.

ſcandals contrarie to the doctrin, which ye haue learned, and auoid them. Saint Iohn Epiſt. 2. v. 10. *If anie man come to ye, and bring not this doctrin, receaue him not into the howſe, nor ſaie, God ſaue you, vnto him. For he that ſaieth, God ſaue you, communicateh with his wicked works.* And Chriſt himſelf Ioan. 10. v. 5. ſaieth, *That his sheep follow not a Stranger, but flie from him:* And v. 8. *that the sheep heare not theeues and robbers.* And Math. 7. v. 15. *Take great heed of fals Prophets.* And whom we are to flie, to auoid, and not to ſalute, we are not to communicate withal. And Numbers 16. v. 24. *God ſaid to Moiſes. Commaund al the people to depart from the Tabernacles of Core, Dathan, and Abiron.* v. 26. *And Moiſes ſaied to the people, depart from the Tabernacles of wicked men, and touch not the things which belong to them, leaſt ye be iuuolued in their ſinns,* Thus God forbad communion with Schiſmatiks, and the ſame reaſon is of heretiks. For thes deuide the profeſſion of the Church of God, as thos deuide her cõmunion.

Chriſts ſheep flie from ſtrangers.

Schiſmatiks to be forſaken.

3. The Fathers alſo teach the ſame. For thus Saint Ireneus lib. 3. c. 4. *Al the reſt* (beſids the Church) *are theeues and robbers, for which we ought to auoid them.* And c. 3. after he had told how Saint Iohn ran out of the roome, where an heretik was, and Saint Policarp would not ſalute an heretik, he addeth. *So great feare had the Apoſtles and their diſciples, not to communicate, ſo much as in word, with anie of them, who had corrupted the truth.* Tertull. l. præſcrip. c. 12. *we are forbiden to goe to heretiks.* And c. 7. *what haue heretiks and Chriſtiãs to doe together?* And c. 41. Noted it as a propertie of heretiks, that they *communicate with al.* S. Cyprian Epiſt. 40. *Goe far from the contagion of thes kinde of men, and by flying, auoid their ſpeeches, as a canker and plague.* And epiſt. 55. *Let there be no commerce with ſuch, and let vs be as much ſeparated from them, as they are from the Church.* S. Hilarie l. de Synodis. *Ye il loue wals, ye il reuerence the Church in howſes and buildings, ye il inculcate the name of peace vnder thes.*

S. Iohn and his diſciples, would not ſpeak with heretiks.

Mountaines, and foreſts, and lakes, and priſons, and gulfes, are ſafer for me. And lib. contra Auxentium. *The name of peace is ſpecious, and the opinion of vnitie is faire, but who doubteth, but the only vnitie of the Church and Goſpel, is that peace, which is Chriſts.* Saint Auguſtin lib. 7. de Baptiſmo c. 45. *Iohn ſaied, that to men of ſtrange doctrin, we ſhould not ſaie: God ſaue ye.* And lib. 2. contra Creſcon c. 2. *Ye are heretiks, and therfore moſt warily to be auoided.* And lib. de vera Religione c. 5. condemneth Philoſophers, *becaus teaching different things of God, yet they frequented the ſame Sacrifices:* and addeth. *So it is beleued and taught, that it is the principal point of mans ſaluation, that there is no other Philoſophie, that is, ſtudie of wiſdome, when they, whos doctrin we approue not, communicate not in Sacraments with vs.* S. Hierom. in 2. Theſſal. 3. *plainely by the authoritie of this place, we muſt withdraw ourſelues from euerie Chriſtian, who walketh not according to the precepts of the Apoſtle,* S. Cyrillus Catech. 18. *And in one Catholik*

Vnitie in Church and Goſpel only, is vnitie in Chriſt.

L. de vnit. c. 4. Quicunq; de ipſo capite ſcripturis conſentiunt & vnitati Eccleſiæ non cõmunicant non ſunt in Eccleſia.

Principal point of ſalnation, not to cõmunicate with heretiks.

Church: that thou maiſt flie the filthie Conuenticles of them (heretiks) *and perſeuer in the Church.* And the Catholiks being beaten of Arians, cried (as reporteth ſaint Athanaſe Epiſt. ad Solitarios) *Beate, as ye pleaſe, we communicate not with heretiks.*

Catholiks cõmunicate not with heretiks.

4. Reaſon alſo sheweth, that we maie not communicate with heretiks or anie falſe Church. Becaus communion in Sacraments and Liturgie with a Church, is a real profeſſion, that she is true: And to profès, that a falſe Church is a true Church of God, is damnable. For it is to profès, that a falſe Church is a Spouſe, and Miſtical Bodie of Chriſt, hath the keyes of heauen, and that in a falſe Church, there maie be ſaluation. Nay, it is by conſequence, a denial of the true Church. For there being but one true Church, if the falſe Church be true, the true Church is falſe. Beſids it is a real forſaking of the true Church, who euer thruſt them out of her communion, who communicated with heretiks. And as one cannot

Communion with a Church, is real approbation of her.

ſerue two oppoſit maſters, be of two oppoſit common wealths, ſo can he not be of tow oppoſit Churches. Moreouer cõmunion in Sacraments is an eſſential part of the Church, as profeſſion of faith, is. Who therſore ioine with heretiks in communion of Sacraments, ioine with them in an eſſential part of their Church. Charitie we muſt haue with al, but communion, with Catholiks onely.

5. Proteſtants alſo confés the ſame. For thus the French Confeſſion art, 18. *we think, al that communicate with Papiſts, to ſeparate themſelues from the bodie of Chriſt.* The Scotts Confeſſion art. 16. *It is neceſſarie, that the true Church be diſcerned from filthie Synagogs, by cleare and perfect Notes, leaſt being deceaued to our damnation, we take the falſe for the true.* The Holanders Confeſſion art. 28. *It is the dutie of al faithful, according to the word of God, to ſeparate themſelues from al them, that are out of the Church.* Whitaker in Præfat. controu. *If we be heretiks, it is reaſon, that they warne al theirs, to flie*

Proteſtants command ſeparation from fals Churches.

vs. And controu. 2. q. 5. c. 1. *we muſt flie and forſake the Churches of Anti-Chriſt, and of heretiks.* Spalatenſis l. 7. de Repub. c. 10. n. 82. *There is no doubt but that heretiks are to be auoided and ſeparated.* Luther alſo and Melanchon (as before we related) wondered, why the Sacramentaries would account them brethren, and yet denie their doctrin. Chillingworth c. 5. p. 276. *Your corruptions in doctrin in themſelues may induce an obligation to forſake your communion.* Morton in his impoſture p. 372. *obſtinacie of error in teachers, affected ignorance and obduration of people, &c. may be iudged neceſſarie cauſes of ſeparation from anie particular Churches.* And Lord Canterburie ſec. 35. p. 296. *He that beleues, as that* (Rom.) *Church beleues, is guiltie of the Schiſme, which that Church hath cauſed by her corruptions, and of al her damnable opinions to.* And yet often times he ſaieth, that the Rom. Church hath not erred fundamentally, is a true Church in eſſence, and her Religion the ſame with that of Proteſtants. And Caluin

hath diuers treatiſes in his Opuſcules for to proue, that it is not lawful to communicate with a falſe Church. *See him alſo in Ioan. 10. v. 1.*

And al are falſe Churches, which voluntarily err againſt anie point of Chriſtian faith ſufficiently propoſed, as before is proued. C. 6.

6. Hence appeareth, that vntruly ſaied Chillingworth c. 5. p. 281. *Neither for ſin, nor for errors, ought a Church to be forſaken, if she do not impoſe and inioine them.* Which he hath alſo p. 209. 307. and Lord Canterburie ſec. 26. p. 196. and Potter ſec. 2. p. 39 if they meane (as doubtles they doe) of ſinful errors, or of errors in matters of faith ſufficiently propoſed. For euerie ſuch Church, is a falſe Church, and beſide the authorities of Scripture, Fathers, and confeſſions of Proteſtãts before rehearſed, the verie remaining in her, is a real profeſſion, that shee is a true Church, and that ſaluation maie be had in her. Which to profés of a falſe Church, is damnable. And hence alſo appeareth, that it is damnable for anie Proteſtant, to communicate with anie Proteſtant

Anie church voluntarily erring is to be forſaken.

See c. 2. n. 1. l. 1 and Caluin cont. verſipel. p. 357.

C. 2. nu. 10. l. 1.

Church, becaus they confés, that al their Churches err in ſome points of faith: And they muſt alſo confés, that they ſinfully err in points ſufficiently propoſed to them, or els condemn themſelues, (eſpecially if they be Miniſters of the word) of damnable negligence of their dutie, towards God, and their Churches, in not shewing ſufficiently to their Churches their errors. At leaſt their Churches might be ſufficiētly informed of their errors, if they would: which is al one, as if they were ſufficiently informed. As themſelues confeſſed c.3.n.6.

None can to liue in a Church, and not cōmunicate with her.

7. Hence alſo is refuted, what Lord Canterburie ſaieth ſec.35.p.296. *It is one thing to liue in a Schiſmatical Church, and not communicate with it in the Schiſme, or in anie falſe worship, that attends it. For ſo Elias liued among the ten Tribes, and was not Schiſmatical.* For to liue in a Schiſmatical Church, is to liue in a Schiſmatical communion. And Elias liued not in a Schiſmatical communion, but only liued among men, that were Schiſmatical.

To liue among Schiſmatical people, is not liue in a Schiſmatical Church.

And this error proceedeth of not diſtinguishing, betweene men, and a Church. One maie liue in companie of men, who are Schiſmatiks: but not in a Schiſmatical Church: for that is to liue in a Schiſmatical ſocietie, or communion.

8. And thus haue we ſufficiently proued, that there be no fundamental, or not fundamental points of faith in the Proteſtants ſenſe, that is, none ſufficient alone to ſauing faith, to conſtitute a Church, or to ſaluation, nor none not neceſſarie, ether actually, or virtually to the conſtitution of a Church, to ſauing faith and ſaluation. But that this diſtinction in this ſenſe bringeth in formal hereſie, deſtroieth true faith, true Church and ſaluation, and is the verie ground of Atheiſme, denying Gods veracitie, and giuing him the lie, euen according to the confeſſion of ſome Proteſtants. Now we wil shew, that this their diſtinction in their sēſe, hath no ground in Scripture, Fathers, Reaſon, or doctrin of Catholiks, as they pretend it hath. c. 3. n. 56.

That the diſtinction of fundamental and not fundamental points in the Proteſtants ſenſe, hath no ground in Scripture, Fathers, reaſon, or doctrin of Catholiks.

TENTH CHAPTER.

1. DOctor Potter ſec. 7. p. 70. ſaieth: *The diſtinction betweene doctrins fundamental and not fundamental, hath ground in reaſon, and Scripture.* True: but not in his ſenſe: His reaſon is, becaus as in humane ſciences, there be principles, and concluſions drawne out of them: So in Religion, there be degrees of truth. For ſome, of it ſelf, is the obiect of faith, ſome, but by accident or ſecundarily. *And it is the common doctrin of Schoolmen and Caſuiſts, that there is a certaine meaſure and quantitie of faith, without which none can be ſaued: but euerie thing reuealed, belongs not to this*

this measure. It is enough to beleue some things by a virtual faith, or by a general and as it were, a negatiue faith, whereby they are not denied or contradicted. This reason indeed proueth that this distinction in some sense is good, that some points of faith are more principal, then others: some more necessarie to be proposed to al, then others, and simply more necessarie to be actually beleued of al, then others: about al which there is no controuersie. But it doth not proue, that there are anie points of faith sufficient to sauing faith, Church, and saluation, though others be proposed and not beleued: or anie Not necessarie to be actually beleued of al, if they be sufficiently proposed to al: or not virtually to be beleued of al, whether they be sufficiently proposed or no: which is al the question: Nay it insinuateth clearely, that al points of faith are to be beleued virtually, and not to be denied or contradicted, and surely they doe not beleue them virtually who denie them, when they are sufficiently

Who haue no virtual or generall faith.

propoſed, or are in fault, that they are not ſufficiently propoſed to them, Let him shew therfore, how Papiſts or
Note this. Lutherans, (whom he accounteth true Churches) haue a virtual, general, or negatiue faith of the Sacramentaries truths, and doe not denie or contradict them; or els this his diſtinction of fundamental and not fundamental points, wil ſo little help him to defend the ſaied Churches to be true Churches, as it wil rather condemne them, and him alſo, for defending them: or let him shew, how anie, who denie or contradict ſome points of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them, (as Papiſts and Lutherans denie and contradict the points of Caluiniſts faith, ſo ſufficiently propoſed to them, as Caluiniſts can propoſe them) haue ſuch a virtual, general, or negatiue faith, wherby they doe not denie, or contradict thos points: or let him confes, that whoſouer denie or contradict anie point of faith ſufficiētly propoſed, haue not ſo much faith, as is ſufficient to ſaluatiō.

His ground out of Scripture, is becaus, ſaieth he, ſec. 7. p. 76. *The dogmatical ground of the Church, are thos grand and capital doctrines, which make vp our faith in Chriſt, that is, that common faith Tit. 1. 4. which is alike pretious in al 2. Petri 1. which the Apoſtle. Hebr. 5. 12. cals the firſt principles of the Oracle of God: And 2. Tim. 1. 13. forme of ſound words* (Thes are his fundamentals) *the materials, laied vpon this foundation, whether they be ſound or vnſound, are named by Saint Paul 1. Cor. 3. 12. ſuperſtructions, which are concluſions, ether in truth, or appearance.* And thes, (if they be ſound) are his not fundamental points. I anſwer. Firſt, that the grand and capital doctrins maie wel be the ground of the Church, and yet not make vp the common faith of Chriſtians. For more is required to a building, then the ground or foundation. Secondly, they maie make vp al the common faith of Chriſtians, which is abſolutly neceſſarie to be beleued actually of al, and yet not make vp al the faith, which abſolutly is ne-

The foundation maketh not vp the building.

ceſſarie ſo be beleued virtually and implicitly of al, and cõditionally alſo actually of al, if it be ſufficiently propoſed vnto them. So that thes places proue not his fundamentals, which are ſo ſufficiẽt to ſauing faith, Church and ſaluation, as others need not ſo much as to be virtually or implicitly beleued, for to haue ſauing faith, Church and ſaluation. And for his *Not fundamentals*, I ſaie, that the place 1. Cor. 3. affordeth no ſolid ground to proue them. Firſt, becaus the place is verie obſcure and hard to be vnderſtood, as Saint Auguſtin witneſſeth l. de fide & operibus c. 15. and 16. queſt. 1. ad Dulcitium, and Enarrat. in Pſal. 80. And Morton tom. 2. Apolog. l. 5. cap. 44. ſaieth: *It is metaphorical, and entangled with manie difficulties.* And the place itſelf doth euidently shew it. And an obſcure and difficult place can giue no ſufficient ground of ſo maine a point, as this is: *That there be ſome points of faith, which are not neceſſarie to ſaluation to be beleued virtually or implicitly, or alſo actually, if they be*

Superſtructions, are not Proteſtants not fundamentals.

S. Aug. epiſt. 48. Quis nõ impudẽtiſſime nititur aliquid in allegoria poſitum pro ſe interpretari, niſi habeat manifeſta teſtimonia quorum lumine illuſtrentur obſcura.

ſufficienily propoſed. Wil D. Potter venture his owne, or other mens ſaluatiõ, in ſo great a matter, vpon an obſcure or difficult text? We with Saint Auguſtin lib. de vnitate demaund, *aliquid manifeſtum, quod interprete non eget.* And you giue vs a place for Not fundamentals in your ſenſe, which no interpretation can make cleare.

No expres text, nor neceſſarie conſequence for Proteſtants not fundamentals.

3. Moreouer, how can you think it certaine, that Saint Paul here by *ſuperſtructions*, meaneth anie doctrin at al, ſeing Saint Auguſtin de fide c. 16. Enchir. c. 68. and Enarrat. in Pſal. 38. 80. and S. Gregorie l. 4. Dialog. c. 39. expound it only of works, nor you conuince the contrarie? Finally, admit, that by *ſuperſtructions* S. Paul meaneth doctrins, how is it certaine, that he meaneth doctrins of faith? and not rather humane doctrins inuented by men? becaus he calleth them *our work*, and points of faith are not our work. Admit alſo, that by *ſuperſtructures*, he meaneth ſome points of faith, how proueth D. P. that S. Paul meaneth, they are not

neceſſarie to ſauing faith, Church, or ſaluation, when they are ſufficiently propoſed, ſeing he nether ſpeaketh of ſufficient propoſal, nor ſaieth, that ſuch ſuperſtructures are not neceſſarie, not yet calleth them ſuperſtructures in reſpect of faith, or Church, but in reſpect of the foundation, as walls and roofe may be called ſuperſtructures in reſpect of the foundatiō, and yet are neceſſarie parts of the houſe. And ſo ſecondarie points of faith may be called ſuperſtructures in reſpect of the principal points, on which they relie as vpon their foundation, and yet be neceſſarie parts of the ſpiritual building of faith and Church.

Proteſtants not fundamentals want foundatiō.

4. So that this ſuperſtruction of D. Potter wanteth ſufficient foundation for his not fouudamentals in his ſenſe, and is a not fundamental foundation for diuers cauſes. Firſt, becaus the place is obſcure, and ſo vnfit to found anie infallible certaintie, eſpecially of this ſo weightie a point. Secondly, becaus it is not certaine, that

the Apoſtle by *ſuperſtructions*, meaneth doctrines, and not only works. Thirdly, becaus though he called ſome doctrins, *ſuperſtructions*, it is not certaine, that he meant doctrins of faith; or if he meant doctrins of faith, that he called them *ſuperſtructions* in reſpect of ſauing faith, Church or ſaluation, and not in reſpect only of other points of faith, on which they are built. And we denie not, but in reſpect of themſelues, ſome points of faith maie be termed fundamental, other not fundamental. Fourthly, becaus though we graunt, that Saint Paul called ſome points of faith, *ſuperſtructions* in reſpect of the Church, or of ſaluation, how proueth D. Potter, that he meant ſo, euen when they are ſufficiently propoſed? we denie not, but ſome points maie be termed *ſuperſtructiõs* in reſpect of ſauing faith, Church or ſaluation, becaus they are not ſo abſolutly neceſſarie to ſauing faith, Church, or ſaluation, to be actually beleued, as ſome other points are. But this wil not proue, that

they are not neceſſarie to ſauing faith Church, and ſaluation, to be actually beleued, if they be ſufficiently propoſed, and neceſſarie virtually to be beleued, howſoeuer. 5. Admit, that he called them *ſuperſtructions*, euen when they are ſufficiently propoſed, how proueth Do. Porter, that he meant, they were not then eſſential to ſauing faith, Church, or ſaluation? Is nothing, that is laied vpon the foundation, eſſential or neceſſarie to the building? And in this is the controuerſie, whether, anie articles, which maie be termed *ſuperſtructions*, be eſſential to ſauing faith, Church, or ſaluation, or no? we ſee the walls and roof are ſuperſtructions to the foundation, and yet eſſential to the houſe. So on euerie hand falleth down Doctor Potters ground out of Scripture, for not fundamental points in the Proteſtants ſenſe; which is, that to haue ſauing faith, Churth, and ſaluation, they need not be beleued actually, though they be propoſed ſufficiently, nor at al, virtually. For if he

Superſtructions may be eſſential.

Sect. 2.

only would, that ſome points of faith are ſo not fundamẽtal to ſauing faith, Church, or ſaluation, as they need not be actually beleued, vnles they be ſufficiently propoſed, and are not abſolutly neceſſarie, as ſome others are, there would be no queſtion. But this kinde of not fundamentals, wil not help him, to iuſtifie his Churches, erring ſinfully in ſome points of faith ſufficiently propoſed, or his communion with ſuch Churches.

How ſome points of faith may be called not fundamental.

5. Other Proteſtants would proue, that true Churches maie err in ſome points of faith ſufficiently propoſed, becaus the Galathiãs were turned to an other Ghoſpel, and the Corinthians denied the Reſurrection: and neuertheles Saint Paul calleth them Churches of God. But this argument, if it were good, would proue more then Proteſtants commonly do teach. For it would proue that true Churches maie err euen in fundamental points, which Proteſtants commonly denie. For doubtles, ſuch were the aforeſaied errors. Secondly, it is euident out of

Perkins and others cited c. 7. n. 1.

Saint Paul himſelf. 1. Cor. 15. verſ. 12. That only ſome of the Corinthiãs denied the Reſurrection. For his words are. *Some among ye ſaie, there is no Reſurrection of the dead.* And the ſame, Proteſtants confés of the Galathians. For thus Sadeel Reſp. ad Arthurum c. 5, *There was a Church among the Galathians, which is denominated of the better parte* Whitaker controuer. 2. q. 5. c. 18. *Some of the Galathians fel from pure faith, not al.* And. c. 19. *The Galathians, that failed, were no Church.* Morton l. 2. Apologi c. 39. *Not al the Corinthians or Galathians, but verie few were drowned in thos errors.* And as Saint Auguſtin ſaieth l. de Anima c. 17. and els where often: The holie Scripture yſeth to ſignifie by a part, the whole, and by the whole, a part.

Catholiks calling the Creed the foundation, is not for D. Potters purpos.

6. Doctor Potter ſec. 7. cit. p. 79. 89. & ſeqq. citeth diuers Fathers and Catholikes calling the Creed the foundation. But this maketh not to his purpoſe, which is, that the Creed alone is eſſential to a true Church, and ſo ſufficient to ſaluation, as no-

See c. 5. n. 2. l. 2.

thing els need be virtually or implicitly beleued, or also actually and explicitly, if it be sufficiently proposed: and in this sense, no Catholik calleth the Creed the foundation. In other senses, the Creed maie wel be called the foundation, ether becaus it conteineth al the most principal and most capital articles: or becaus al other points of faith depend on it: or becaus it must be actually beleued of al, nether sufficeth it that it be only virtually beleued: Nether wil it follow, that the Creed alone is essential or sufficient to a Church, becaus it alone is the foundation therof, better then it wil follow, that the foundation alone is essential or sufficient to a house, becaus it alone is the foundation. At most wil follow, that it is the cheif essential parte of the Church, on which the rest essential parts depend, becaus it alone is the foundation: which we willingly graunt. And vpon such weak foundations as thes: depend D. Potters proofes, that the Creed alone is essential to the Church. And that

How the Creed may be called the foundation.

VVhat is alone the foundation, is not alone essential or necessarie.

who beleveth the Creed, hath ſauing faith, is in the true Church, and in true waie of ſaluation, though he beleue not, or disbeleue other points of faith ſufficiently propoſed. Hence it appeareth alſo, why (as I ſaied before) they rather ſaie ſome articles alone, are fundamental or the foundation, then that ſome alone, are neceſſarie; becaus ſome articles are in ſome ſenſe the only foundation of the Church and of ſaluation, but in no ſenſe are only neceſſarie. For al poins of faith are two waies neceſſarie. Firſt, abſolutly neceſſarie, to be virtually and implicitly beleued. Secondly, conditionally, to be beleued alſo actually, if they be ſufficiently propoſed. Thus we haue ſeene, that Doctor Potter hath not ſo much as anie probable ground, much les certaine and infallible (as he ought to haue for ſo weightie a matter) for the diſtinction of fundamental and not fundamental points in his ſenſe, ether in Scripture, Fathers, reaſon, or Catholiks doctrin. Now let vs shew that though we

L. Cant. p. 29. Deductions are neceſſarie to ſome, but not fundamental.

Some articles be the foundation, but not alone neceſſarie.

granted him his distinctiõ in his sense, yet it would not, suffice to mainteine the Protestants Churches, for mainteining wherof, it was deuised, as Rouse confessed, sup. c. 1. and is most certaine.

THAT THOVGH THE Protestants distinction of fundamental and not fundamental articles vvere admitted in their sense, it vvould not suffice to their purpose.

ELEVENTH CHAPTER.

1. THat though the Protestants distinction of fundamental and not fundamental articles were admitted euen in their owne sẽse, yet it would not suffice to their pur pose, is euident. For the cheif end, for which they deuised this distinction in their sense, was therby to defend, that Protestant Churches, though they be

ſinfully deuided in matters of faith, yet be true Churches, and haue ſauing faith, and meanes of ſaluation, becaus (forſooth) they differ but in not fundamental points, and ſuch points are no waie eſſential, nor neceſſarie to a true Church, nor to ſauing faith, or ſaluation. For Lutheran Proteſtants are deuided from Caluiniſts, not only in not fundamental, or not principal points of faith, but alſo in fundamental and principal points: nor only in points of faith, but alſo in communion of Liturgie and publik ſervice: both which diuiſions deſtroie a true Church.

2. That diuiſion in fundamental points deſtroieth a Church, is the common doctrin of Proteſtants, as is before shewed lib. 1. c. 7. nu. 5. 6. 7. Nether can they denie it, becaus by *fundamental*, they profés to vnderſtand eſſential: And euident it is, that diuiſion in eſſential parts deſtroieth the whole, becaus the whole is nothing but al its eſſential parts ioined together. And that Lutherans are

deuided from Caluiniſts in fundamental points, both Lutherans and Caluiniſts profés.

3. For thus Luther diſput. contra Louanienſes Tom. 2. fol. 203. *In earneſt, we iudge to be heretiks, and out of the Church of God, Zuinglians, and al Sacramentaries, who denie the bodie and Blood of Chriſt to be receaued with carnal mouth in the venerable Euchariſt.* And this ſentence he pronounced againſt the Sacramentaries anno 1545. as Hoſpinian 2. parte hiſtor. writeth in that yeare; and died the next yeare, 18. Feb. as he teſtifieth anno 1546. And in anno 1544. he relateth thes words of Luther, *I, who am now neare my death, wil carrie with me this teſtimonie and this glorie to the Tribunal of Ieſus Chriſt, that with al my heart I haue damned and auoided the Swarmers, enemies of the Sacraments, Carolſtadius, Zuinglius, Oecolampadius, and their diſciples, and we ſtil damn them in Sermons. And their lying and blaſphemous hereſie.* And tom. 7. in defen. verb. Cenæ fol. 381. he thus ſpeaketh: *I wil*

Luther condemns the Sacramentaries.

Luthers glorie before God, to condēne Sacramentaries.

 The Proteſtants diſtinction

cal God and the whole world to witnes, that I do not think with Sacramentaries, nor euer did think, nor for euer, (God willing) wil think. And fol. 382. *Curſed for euer be that charitie and concord* (with Sacramentaries.) *The one partie muſt needs be ſet on by the diuel, we wil auoid them to the laſt breath, we wil reproue and damn them, for Idolaters, corrupters of Gods word, blaſphemers, and deceauors.* And there calleth them *masked Diuels, who bring in the diuel inſteed of God.* And that, he ſhould recal this iudgment of the Sacramentaries before his death, is feigned by ſome without al ſufficient proof.

He curſeth agreement with them.

3. And this his ſentence, our English Proteſtants ſhould feare, becaus in the Apologie of their Church, they profés to hold him for a *moſt excellent man, and ſent from God to lighten the world.* And Caluin l. 1. de libero arbit. calleth him, a *Notable Apoſtle of Chriſt*: and ſaieth, *that God thundered by his mouth.* D. Potter ſec. 3. p. 83. *we eſteme of Luther as a worthie man.* So Field l. 2. de Eccleſ. c. vlt. l. 3. c. 42.

And

And did this worthie man, who thus ſeuerely condemned the Sacramentaries doctrin, differ *rather in formes or phraſes of ſpeech, then in ſubſtance of doctrin*, as D. Potter affirmeth ſec. 3. p. 89. or *onely in diſputable opinions*, as he ſaieth ſec. 6. p. 54.

4. Nether did Luther only, but euen the publik confeſſions of Lutherans condemn the Sacramentaries doctrin. For thus the Confeſſion of Auſpurg in Hoſpin l. cit. anno 1530, *Of the Lords Supper, thus we teach: That the true Bodie and Blood of Chriſt, is truly vnder the forme of bread and wine preſent in the Supper, and there diſtributed and receaued. wherfore the contrarie doctrin, is reiected.* Confeſſion of Bohemia art. 11. *Certaine phanatical Spirits, not abiding in the words of Chriſt, denie the bread and chalice of the Supper, to be the Bodie and Blood of Chriſt.* And in like manner do the Lutherans in their Confeſſion of Swed, (which was put forth 1563.) of Mansfeld, and of Antwerp, condemne the Sacramentaries.

Confeſſion of Auſpurg damneth Sacramentaries.

5. And the Sacramentaries doe the ſame to Lutherans. For thus the Czengerin Confeſſion, placed in the Syntagme of Proteſtant Confeſſions p. 194. *As we damne the Papiſtical dotage of Tranſubſtantiation: ſo we alſo damne their madnes, who mainteine fleasheating, that is, that Chriſts natural and bloodie bodie is receaued with carnal mouth, without anie mutation or tranſubſtantiation.* And they add: *This is contrarie to the rule of faith, and nature.* The Confeſſion of Swiſers art. 21. *The flesh of Chriſt cannot be corporally eaten, without wickednes and crueltie.* The Palatines Confeſſion: *Chriſt cannot now, without manifeſt and horrible Idolatrie, be ſaught in the bread of the Supper.* Item, *we ſee a horrible diſtraction raiſed in the Church, becaus ſome wil eate and drink the bodie and Blood of Chriſt, naturally, eſſentially, with their corporal mouthes, and who refuſe to beleue and profes this, are proclamed ſacrilegious and blaſphemous Sacramentaries.*

Sacramentaries condemn Lutherans.

Of wickednes.

Of horrible idolatrie.

6. Thus Proteſtants in their publik Confeſſions of faith, condemne

one the other. And that the cheifeſt Maiſters of the Caluiniſts condemne the Lutherans of error in fundamental matters, I haue shewed l. 1. c. 6. nu. 8. and more maie be ſeene l. 1. of the Author of Proteſtancie c. 3. nu. 5. Here I wil relate the Confeſſion of the Tigurins, in their preface to the Orthodox conſent, ſet forth 1585. Of the great and manifold contentions betweene Proteſtants. For thus they

See P. Martyr in epiſ. ad Eccleſ. Aug. Perkins in ſymb. col. 781. 793. Caluin 4. inſtit. c. 4. §. 19.

Tigurins confeſs diſſentions of Proteſtants.

Nether of the Lords Supper only, but alſo of Chriſts perſon, of the Vnion of the diuine and humane nature, of the Vbiquitie of his bodie, of the corporal (and which is made with mouth and teeth, and common to good and bad) eating of his bodie, of his aſcenſion into heauen, and ſitting at the right hand of his Father, is contended with ſuch earneſt diſpute, that not few of the old hereſies, which were long ſince condemned and extinguiſhed, begin againe to lift vp their heads, as recalled out of hel. And did not thes men know, what diuiſion there is among Lutherans and Caluiniſts, as wel as D. Potter ſect. 3. pag. 89. Doe

Potter sec. 4. p. 119. The errors of vbiquitie consubstantiation and the like, are groß and palpable.

Thes differ rather in formes or phrases of speech then in subſtãce of doctrin? or as others saie, they differ not in fundamental points? Are not the person of Chriſt, his hypoſtatical vnion, his aſcenſion to heauen, and ſitting at the right hand of his father, fundamental points! Are they not in the Creed, which commonly is saied to be the foundation of Chriſtianitie? or did not the Tigurins know, wherin Proteſtants diſſent, as wel as he? wil Proteſtants not only make fundamental or not fundamental what they pleaſe, as Donatiſts made crimes, but alſo when, or in whom they liſt? Thus we ſee, that the diſtinction of fundamental and not fundamental points, wil not mainteine the Proteſtants Churches. For they condemne one the other of fundamental errors. Now let vs ſee, that it wil not ſerue them, for want of Communion in Sacraments, and in publik ſeruice of God.

C 6. n. 2. l. 1.

Aug. de vnico Baptiſ. c. 14.

That the Proteſtants diſtinction of fundamental and not fundamental Articles, vvil not ſuffice to mainteine ſuch Churches, as they would, for vvant of communion.

TWELFT CHAPTER.

1. ALbeit we should grant to Proteſtants, both, that ſome articles are ſo ſufficient to conſtitute à Church, as no other articles were neceſſarie thervnto, and alſo, that their Churches doe hold al thos articles, which are ſo ſufficient; (nether of which we shal euer grant) yet neuertheles, would it not follow, that their Churches are true Churches. For nether anie certaine articles, nor al articles together, are ſufficient to conſtitute a true Church of Chriſt, without communion in Sacraments, Liturgie, and publik worship of God.

No certaine articles are ſufficient without others.

Ner none at al without communion.

Which communion, becauſe Proteſtants Churches want, both with themſelues (as is euident in Lutherans and Caluiniſts) and alſo with al other ſuch Churches, as they account true Churches: Therfore when they wil proue, ether their owne, or anie other Church, to he a true Church, they make no mention at al of cõmunion, but only of fundamental articles: and infer, their owne, or other Churches, (whom they pleaſe) to be true Churches, only becaus they hold the fundamental articles: wherin they commit a Triple fallacie. For nether are anie principal articles alone, ſufficient to the conſtitution of a Church: nether doe Proteſtants hold al principal articles: nether though they held al articles whatſoeuer, would that ſuffice to conſtitute a true Church, without communion in Sacramẽts and publik worshtp of God. Which we proue to be eſſential to a true Church, out of the definitions of a true Church, giuen by Scripture, Fathers, and Proteſtants themſelues, and cõfirme it by reaſon.

Roman, Grecian, &c.

Triple fallacie of Proteſtants.

2. The Scripture Acts 2. vers. 42. describing the true Church, or true disciples of Christ, saieth: *They were perseuering in the doctrin of the Apostles, and communication of breaking bread, and praier.* Where communication in Sacraments and praier, is put as essential a parte of the true Church, as perseuerance in the doctrin of the Apostles is. And Caluin vpon this place expoundeth it of communication of the Supper, and publik praiers: And saieth: *we must be such, if we will be truly accounted the Church before God.* And 1. Cor. 1. when there was a Schisme among the Corinthiãs, and one saied he was of Paul, an other of Apollo, an other of Cephas, The Apostle reprouing them, saied v. 13. *Is Christ deuided?* As if it should follow, that Christ were deuided, if his mystical Bodie the Church, were deuided. Besids, al the places of Scripture, which before we brought to proue, that the Church of Christ is absolutly one, proue, that she cannot be deuided in communion of Sacraments.

Scripture puts cõmunion in the definition of the Church.

c. 7 nu. 2. l. 2.

For ſuch a deuided Church, is not abſolutly one, but in parte, or in ſome ſort only. The ſame alſo is euident out of our Creed: where we profes to beleue *the Catholik Church, the cõmunio of Saints*. Where *communion of Saints*, is ether an explication of *Cath. Church*, as * Proteſtants commonly teach, or a thing neceſſarily required to it. For it makes no diſtinct article.

* *Caluin 4. c.1. parag.3. Confeſsio Scotica art. 16. Catech Gal. Domi. 15 Pleſſie de Eccleſ. c. 1. Kemnit. loc. de Eccleſ c.1. See Potter ſcc.7.p.88.*

3. The Fathers alſo (as Moulins confeſſed * before) by the Church, *vnderſtand the whole ſocictie of Chriſtian Churches, orthodox and ſound in faith, vnited together in communion, and oppoſe it to heretiks and Schiſmatiks*. So that they make vnion in communion, (which excludeth Schiſmatiks, who are deuided in cõmunion) as eſſential a part of the Church, of which they meane, as orthodoxie or ſoundnes in faith, which excludeth heretiks. And it is manifeſt by al Fathers, that they exclude, as wel Schiſmatiks, out of the Church, who yet want nothing but communion in Sacraments: as heretiks, who want ſoundnes in faith.

* *c.6.n.3.l.2*

Fathers put ſuch cõmunion, as is oppoſit to Sciſmatiks.

S. Aug. Ep. 50 Donatiſtæ de ſola cõmunione litigant. See him 4. cõt. Creſcon. c. 66.

And their teſtimonies maie be ſeene l. 2. of the Author of Proteſtancie c. 15. And namely Saint Auguſtin l. 19. contra Fauſtum c. 11. ſaieth: *Men cannot be ioined into anie name of Religion, true or falſe, vnles they be linked with ſome ſigne or fellowship of viſible Sacraments.* So that there can be nether true nor falſe Religion, without communion in Sacraments. And epiſt 118. ſaieth. *God hath ioined the ſocietie of his new people by Sacraments.*

S. Auguſt. puts cõmunion in Sacraments, of the eſſence of Religion.

4. Reaſon alſo conuinceth, that cõmunion in Sacraments and publik worship of God, is eſſential to the true Church of Chriſt. For his Church, is a Societie in profeſſion of his faith and vſe of his Sacraments, as al men conceaue and define. And it implieth contradiction, that there should be a Societie, without cõmunion in matters eſſentially belonging to the ſocietie: as Sacramẽts belong to Chriſts Church. For if there be no communion in vſe of Sacraments, there is no ſocietie in vſe of Sacraments: And if no Societie in vſe of Sacraments, no

Reaſon alſo.

Confeſſio Anglica art. 19. Scotica c. 18. Saxonica c. 12. VVittenbergica c. de Eccleſ.

Church. For a Church is essentially a societie in profession of faith and vse of Sacraments. And Protestants, who profés to giue none but essential Notes of the Church, giue right vse of the Sacraments for a note of her. Wherfore what Churches are deuided in vse of Sacraments, are deuided in an essential parte, and consequently essentially.

Sect. 6. n. 5. l. 2.

2. *Without communion the Church differs not from schismatiks.*

Moreouer, without communion in Sacraments and publik worship of God, the Church should not differ essentially from a Schismatical Church. And it implieth contradiction, that the true Church should not differ essentially from a false Church. For els a false Church should substantially be a true Church.

3.

Furthermore, vse of Sacraments and publik worship of God, was the external end for which the Church was instituted, and vse of the Baptisme and of the Eucharist are commanded by Christ, Ioan. 3. Luc 22. How then can the true Church be deuided in her principal external end?

4.

Besids, the true Church, is the mystical Bodie of

Chriſt, and therfore, as al the members of a natural bodie communicate one with an other, ſo muſt the members of the true Church. Nether did Chriſt inſtitute a Church deuided in communion. Therfore a Church ſo deuided, is no Church of Chriſts inſtitution. Finally, al the arguments, wherwith before we proued, the true Church to be ſimply and abſolutly one, proue that she cannot be deuided in communion of Sacraments, and publik worship of God. For a Church ſo deuided, in not ſimply one. 5. 6. c. 7, l. 2.

5. The ſame alſo is manifeſt by Confeſſions of Proteſtants. For Confeſſio Argentinenſis c. 12. ſaieth: *God would haue his to haue external ſocietie together, for which cauſe he gaue them Sacraments.* Confeſſio Heluetica c. 21. *we are admonished by the Celebration of the Lords Supper, that we remember of what bodie we be members, and therfore agree with al brethren.* Mulhuſina art. 5. *The Lords Supper is vſed in the Church, to teſtifie faith and fraternal charitie.*

Proteſtants confes that the Church is a ſocietie in Sacraments.

Conſenſus Poloniæ : *The Lord would haue his Supper to be the Sinew of publik Congregation.* Saxonica c. 15. *God would haue this receauing of the Euchariſt, to be the band of publik congregation, and the band of mutual charitie among the members of the Church.* Caluin 4. inſtit. c. 1. §. 7. *The Church, by participation of the Supper, doth teſtifie vnitie in true doctrin and charitie.* See him alſo ibid. §. 8. Whitaker alſo controuer. 2. q. 5. c. 20. Approueth the definition of the Church, giuen by Bellarm. thus far. *The Church is a companie of men, ioint together in profeſſion of the ſame faith, and communion of Sacramẽts, vnder lawful Paſtors.* Where cõiunction in Communion of Sacraments, is put, as an eſſential parte of the Church. And ibid. c. 17. *Sincere preaching of the word, and lawful vſe of the Sacraments, make the Church. So as, where they are not, the Church is not.* Moulins lib. 1. contra Perõ c. 26. *That is the true Church, which is ioined together by profeſſion of true faith, and communion of Sacraments.* And cap. 25. *The queſtion* (which is the

So Potter ſec. 7. p. 98.

Caluin in Ioan. 9. Peſſimũ in Eccleſia, & maxime noxium malũ, eſt ſchiſma.

Proteſtants put communion in Sacraments, in definition of the Church.

VVhere is not lawful vſe of Sacraments the Church is not.

true Church) *is, touching the entire bodie of the Orthodox Church, ioint in Communion: we ask, by what external Notes, we maie diſcerne this Church.* Spalatenſis lib. 7. de Repub. cap. 12. num. 132. *To the true Church, twoe things only are required, to wit, entire faith in Chriſt, and communion with al faithful that profes this faith.* Confeſſion of Auſpurg art. 7. *To the true vnitie of the Church, it is enough, to conſent in the doctrin of the Ghoſpel, and miniſtration of Sacraments.* Sadeel cont. Tur. loc. 30. *True vſe of Sacraments, is eſſential to the Church.* Caluin 4. iuſtit. c. 1. §. 2. *Vnles vnder Chriſt our Head, we be vnited to al the other members, we can haue no hope of heauen. There cannot be twoe or three Churches, but Chriſt muſt be deuided.* And §. 10. Ib. *departure from the Church is denial of God and Chriſt. God ſo much eſteemeth the communion of his Church, as he accounteth him a Renegate and Forſaker of his Religion, who obſtinatly ſeparateth himſelf from anie Chriſtian ſocietie, which hath the true miniſterie of the word and Sacraments.* See him alſo

The queſtiō about the Church, is about the entire bodie Orthodox, and ioint in communion.

Vſe of Sacraments is eſſential.

in Ioa 9. Plessie de Eccl. c. 1. *We cōfés in the Creed, that the Church is the Cōmunion of Saints.* So also Confessio Heluetica c. 17. Mulhusina art. 5. Argetinensis c. 15. How then, can the Church, which we profés in our Creed, be without Communion? King Iames Resp. ad Peron p. 384. *Damneth and deteſteth thos, who haue left the Communion of the Church, and become Schismatiks.* Casaubon exercitat. 15. *It is an vndoubted truth, that whiles pious people adhere to a lawful and true Bishop, that is a true Church of God. So that if anie separate himself from that companie, it cannot be doubted, but he is out of the Church.* D. Potter sec. 3. p. 74. *Whosoeuer professeth himself to forsake the communion of anie one member of the bodie of Christ, must confés himself consequently to forsake the whole.* Musculus loco de Eccles. sec. 3. *The true Church, is a Communion and societie of true beleuers.* Perkins in explicat. Symboli col. 794. *As long as anie Church goeth not from Christ, we maie not separate from it.* The same he hath in his Reformed Catholik tract. 21.

The Church of the Creed is a communion.

See Iunius in sub Ecclesiastico c. 4.

The Church is a Cōmunion of beleuers.

And Proteſtants commonly, who exclude Schiſmatiks out of the Church, as is to be ſeene l. 1. of the Author of Proteſtancie c. 1. and yet confés, they want nothing but communion, as is to be ſeene ibidem lib. 2. cap. 15. I wil here ad the Confeſſion of D. Potter ſec. 2. p. 42. *Schiſme is no les damnable, then hereſie.* P. 47. *Voluntarie and vngrounded ſeparation from the Catholik Communion, is without doubt à damnable ſchiſme.* And p. 56. *Whoſoeuer peruerſly deuides himſelf from the Catholik Communion, as doe Schiſmatiks, his condition is damnable.* Finally, Whitaker controuer. 2. qu. 5. c. 17. p 541. ſaieth: *Almoſt al our men put thes twoe Notes of the Church, to wit, pure preaching of the word, and lawful adminiſtration of Sacramẽts. And thes twoe we affirme to be true and certaine Notes of the Church, and eſſential and perpetual Symboles of the Church.* And if lawful miniſtration of Sacraments, be a true and eſſential Symbol of the Church, how can Churches be deuided in miniſtration of Sacraments, and not be deuided

Proteſtants exclude ſchiſmatiks who want but communion.

Schiſme as damnable, as hereſie.

Lawful uſe of ſacraments, is eſſential.

in an eſſential parte?

6. Hence it is euident, that the Proteſtant Church, which is deuided in communion of Sacraments, and publik worship of God, not only in itſelf, but alſo from al other Churches, which they account true Churches, is no ſuch Church, as Scripture, Fathers, Reaſon, and themſelues ſometimes, propoſe vnto vs. Nether wil it help, which Doctor Potter ſaieth ſec. 3. p. 67. and ſec. 1. p. 19. and Chillingworth c. 5. p. 274. *That they are vnited to al members of the vniuerſal Church, in faith and charitie.* For to omit, that Proteſtants cannot pretend vnion in faith with al members of the vniuerſal Church, but only vnion in parte of faith; becaus they pretend vnion only in fundamental points; which are but a parte of faith; Vnion in charitie cannot be that vnion, which the Scripture, and Fathers, put in the deſcriptions of the Church For the * Scripture ſpeaketh of vnion in Sacraments and praier. The

Vnion in charitie is not the eſſential vnion of the Church

* *Cõmuniõ, in Scripture, is in Sacraments, and praier; alſo by Fathers.*

The* Fathers speak of such a vnion, as is opposit to schisme, which is breach in communion of Sacraments and publik worship. And Saint Augustin expresly speaketh of vnion in Sacraments, which he saieth is necessarie to anie kinde of Religion, true or false: and also of vnion in praier. For thus he speaketh to a Schismatik: *Doe not saie, I haue charitie: proue it, we haue one Father, let vs praie together.* Besids, Protestants themselues put the communion of the Church in external things. Confessio Heluetica cap. 17. *The true concord of the Church consisteth in doctrins, and rites expresly giuen by God.* Whereby *Rites* they vnderstand *Sacraments.* King Iames Respon. ad Peron pag. 403. *Communion among the faithful, cheifly consisteth in publik exercises of pietie.* And Chillingworth c. 5. p. 265. *To leaue the external communion of a Church, is by refusing to communicate with anie Church, in her Liturgie, and publik worship of God.* Field lib. 1. c. 15. *The communion of the Church consisteth in praiers and dispensation of Sacraments.*

* *sup. n.* 2. *sup. n.* 3.

* *Cocion. de Gestis cum Emerito.*

And by Protestants

Cõmunio of the Church, is in sacraments, and Liturgie.

V

And l. 2. c. 2. ſaieth, *communion in ſacraments is eſſential to the Church.* So alſo ibid. c. 4. and Hooker lib. 3. p. 130. The communion therfore, which is eſſential to the viſible Church, is in rites or Sacraments, publik exerciſes of pietie, Liturgie, and publik worſhip of God. Nether euer yet did anie Proteſtant define the viſible Church, to be a ſocietie in profeſſion of faith, and communion of charitie: which they both would, and muſt haue done, if they had thought cõmunion in charitie, to be an eſſential parte of the viſible Church.

Cõmunion in charitie cannot be eſſential to a Church.

7. But indeed it cannot be eſſential to a viſible Church. Firſt, becaus it is no waie proued, but merely affirmed, by reaſon that Proteſtants can pretend no other communion with the vniuerſal Church. For it is euident, they haue no communion with her, in Sacraments, and publik worſhip of God. Secondly, becaus the eſſential parts of the viſible Church muſt be viſible, as profeſſion of faith, is: otherwiſe, not the external Church it-

1.

See c. 13. n 5. l. 2.

2.

ſelf, but only ſome parte of it, should be viſible. And communion in charitie is nether viſible by itſelf, nor by anie vndoubted acts therof; as the ſoule of man is viſible by her vndoubted vital acts. Thirdly, becaus if communion in charitie were an eſſential parte of the viſible Church, none that want charitie, should be true mẽbers of the viſible Church. And ſo wicked men should be nether of the inuiſible nor viſible Church. Which is contrarie to the Confeſſions of faith of Proteſtants. And Chillingworth cap. 5. p. 255. When his Aduerſarie had ſaied: *That al the mẽbers of the viſible Church, are by charitie vnited into one myſtical Bodie*, replieth thus: *which is manifeſtly vntrue, for manie of them haue no charitie*. How then can vnion in charitie, be that communion, which is eſſential to the viſible Church; ſeing they, that want charitie, maie be true members of the viſible Church, who cannot be vnited in charitie, which they haue not? True it is, that who break the cõmunion of the Church,

3.

Auguſt art. 7.8. Saxon art. 12. Caluin 4.c. 1.parag.13. whitak.cõt. 2.q. 5.c.3.

as Schiſmatiks doe, haue not charitie, and charitie hindereth that breach: But yet not al, that want charitie, break communion. And one thing it is, to want charitie, an other to make Schiſme in the Church: And charitie is loſt by Schiſme, but not only by
4. Schiſme. Beſids, what charitie haue Proteſtants to al the members of the vniuerſal Church, but ſuch as they muſt haue to Iewes, Turks, Infidels, and generally to al that are out of the Church, that is, to praie for them, and wish and doe them good? A ſingular cõmunion ſurely, with the members of the vniuerſal Church, which they haue common to al Infidels, and men whatſoeuer. Is there no communion peculiar to the mẽbers of the vniuerſal Church, which they haue among themſelues, and one to an other, more thẽ they haue to Infidels? If Proteſtãts had indeed true charitie ether toward God, or the vniuerſal Church, they would not ſeparate themſelues from her communion in Sacraments, and publik worship of God. For as S. Aug.

lib. 1. de Sermone Domini c. 3. *If they had charitie, they would not teare in peeces the Bodie of Chriſt, which is the Church.* But they doe external acts againſt charitie, and vainely pretend inward charitie. And it is contrarie to charitie both towards themſelues and others, to forſake the communion in Sacraments, and publik worship of God, of the vniuerſal Church. For ſo (as is before shewed) they put themſelues out of al Churches, and become in none. And out of al that hath beneſaied hitherto of faith and Communion, appeareath euidently how fondly Proteſtants infer themſelues or other Churches or perſons, whom they pleaſe, to be true Churches, or true members of the Church, or in the way of ſaluation, onely becaus they beleue al the fundamental points. For that is not enough to a true Church, or to a true member therof, or to the way of ſaluation. But they should add alſo, that they doe not ſinfully err in anie other point of faith, or in Communion. Becaus

Proteſtant inference abſurd.

if they ſinfully err in anie point of faith, they are Heretiks: and if they ſinfully err in Communion, they are Schiſmatiks: and ſo no true Churches, nor true mẽbers of the Church, nor in the way of ſaluation. But becaus Proteſtants deſpaire to proue, that ſuch Churches or perſons, as they mainteine, doe not err ſinfully at al in faith or communion, they ſpeak not of this: and damnably deceaue thos that beleue onely fundamẽtal points. But now, out of that which we haue ſaied of the Communion of the Church, let vs refel the Proteſtants errors concerning it.

Proteſtants errors about communion, refuted out of vvhat vvas ſaied in the former Chapter.

THIRTEENTH CHAPTER.

1. OVt of that, which we have ſaied of Communion, are clearly refuted the errors of Proteſtants touching the ſame: their firſt, and radical error, and the foundation of the reſt, is, that * Communion is not eſſential to a true Church, or to a true member of the Church. For Communion is put in the definitions of the Church taken out of Scripture, and giuen by Fathers, and Proteſtants themſelues: and therfore eſſential to a true Church, and to euerie true member of it: If anie aske, how then can a true mẽber of the Church, be without Communion, as if he be in a Deſert or be by force hindered

* *King Iames reſp. ad Peron p. 384*

from Communion? I anſwer, that natural or material things cannot be without natural or material exiſtence of euerie eſſential parte of them; But moral things (ſuch as a member of the Church is, depending of mans wil) maie be when ſome eſſential parte is only morally, and by effectual wil. And ſo Communion of a man in a Deſert, or held by force, morally maie be. For it is in his wil to be done, when he can, and ought to communicate: and neuer leaueth to be, til he haue a wil the contrarie, as Schiſmatiks have. And it is eſſential, and ſufficient to a true member of the Church, when he cannot actually communicate with the Church, to profés to haue this wil to communicate whenſoeuer he can, and ought.

Moral thing may haue their partes but morally.

2. An other error of Proteſtans is, that to leave the external communion of the Church, is not to leave the Church: as one maie leave the cuſtome of the Colledg, yet not the Colledg! ſo Chillingworth,

c. 5. p. 265. 269. For Communion is essential to the Church, and to leaue an essential parte of a thing, is to leave the thing itself: wheras the custome of a Colledg is accidental to a Colledg, and to leave the accident of a thing, is not to leave the thing it self.

To leaue an essential parte, is to leaue the whole.

3. An other error is, which D. Potter hath sec. 3. p. 74. *that they forsake not the Communion of the Church of Rome, no more then the Bodie of Christ:* For to refuse to communicate with her in vse of Sacraments, Liturgie, and publik worship, is to forsake her communion. And he that meanes otherwise by *Communion*, speaks a new language as indeed à new doctrin, needs à new language, or equivocation to vphold it. Wherfore Chillingworth c. 5. p. 261. saieth. *It needs no proof, that Luther and his followers forsook the external communion of the Roman Church.*

4. An other error, which Chillingworth hath c. 5. p. 270. is, that *the whole Church being corrupted, some parts of it,*

might, and did reforme themselues, and yet might, and did continue parts of the Church, though separated from the external communion of the other parts, which would not reforme. As a man maie renounce a vice of a societie, and yet be stil of the Societie. And p. 271. *It is certainly false, that no twoe men or Churches, deuided in external communion, can be both true parts of the Cath. Church.* This I saie is easily refuted. For to omit, that blasphemie (that the whole Church can be corrupted) whosoever volũtarily separate themselues from the external cõmunion of the whole Church, separate themselues from an essential part of her. For external communion is as essential to the visible Church, as is profession of faith. And al thes errors rise, of not considering or remembring wel, the former definitions of the true Church, giuen by Scripture, Fathers, and themselues, and confirmed by reason. In al which, *Communion*, is put as an essẽtial part of that true Church, which Scripture, Fathers, Reason, and

Roote of the Protestants errors.

(ſomtimes) alſo Proteſtans, propoſe vnto vs.

Proteſtants forſake the external communion of the viſible Church.

5. And herevpon it is evident, that Chillingworth in confeſſing c. 5. cit. p. 273. *That as for the external communion of the viſible Church, we haue without ſcrupule formerly granted, that Proteſtants did forſake it.* And p. 274. *Though Luther forſooke the external communion of the Cath. Church, it wil not follow, he was a Sciſmatike*: Plainely confeſſeth, that Luther and Proteſtants are true Sciſmatiks, and by forſaking the external communion of the * whole viſible or Catholik Church, ether made a new viſible Church, or are in no viſible Church at al: For the external communion of the whole viſible Church, was an eſſential parte of her, as wel as profeſſion of faith: And none can leaue an eſſential parte of the whole viſible Church, but he muſt leaue the whole viſible Church, which is to make a formal ſchiſme For he cannot leaue the whole viſible Church, but he muſt be in no viſible Church,

* *Chilling. p. 263. The viſible Ch. ſignifieth the whole Church.*

VVho is out of the whole viſible Ch. is in none.

ſeing the whole viſible Church, includeth al viſible Churches; or he muſt be in a new ſubſtantial viſible Church, which muſt be, of his owne making. And hence it is euidēt, why there can be no iuſt cauſe to leaue the communion of the whole viſible Church, becaus there can be no iuſt cauſe to put onesſelf out of al viſible Churches, and to be in no viſible Church at al. There maie be iuſt cauſe of ſeparation from the communion of ſome particular Church, becaus she maie inuincibly err in ſome points of faith, and exact profeſſion of her errors, for a condition of her communion. And nether is it neceſſarie to ſaluation, or to a member of the true Church, to be in communion of euerie particular Church; nor the going out of anie particular Church (if there be iuſt cauſe for it) is the going out of the whole true Church: But the whole true Chnrch, is not fallible, vincibly or inuincibly, in anie point of faith, by reaſon of Chriſts promiſe, and the holie Ghoſts aſſiſtance. So that, for

VVhy no iuſt cauſe, to goe out of the whole viſible Church.

VVhy may be iuſt cauſe, to goe out of a particular Church.

pretence of errors, there can be no iuſt cauſe to go out of her cõmunion. And the going out of her, is the going out of al Churches whatſoeuer, becaus the whole Church includeth al, and who is out of al, is in none. And there cannot be imagined anie iuſt cauſe, to goe out of al Churches, and to be in none at al: And hereby we ſee, how the infallibilitie of the whole Church, and neceſſitie of being in the whole Church, do mutually infer each the other. For if she were not infallible in matters of faith, but ſinfully taught errors, one might iuſtly goe out of her. And becaus there can be no iuſt cauſe to goe out of the whole Church (for thon we should be in none at al) it muſt needs be, that she is infallible in matters of faith.

L. Canterb. p. 311. out of the Cath. Church there is no ſaluation.

Infallibilitie, and neceſſitie to be in the whole Church, proue one the other.

Canterb. p. 240. Al the members of the militant Church can not err. So Mortõ Imp. c. 15. ſec. 3. and 4.

6. Wherfore, when Chillingworth c. 5. p. 264. 271. 274. 284. and Proteſtants commonly define, Schiſme, *to be a Cauſeles ſeparation from the communion of the Church*, they voluntarily ad that particle (*Cauſeles*) nether do they finde it in anie definition of Fa-

Potter ſect. 2. p. 47. Canterb. p. 143.

Proteſtants falſe definition of Schiſme.

thers, who neuer admit anie iuſt cauſe of ſeparatiõ from the whole Church: but Proteſtants merely ad it, to excuſe themſelues from Schiſme, becaus they haue ſome pretence of cauſe for ſeparation, but no colour al at, to denie their ſeparation from the whole Church: yea they plainly confés it, as is to be ſeen l. 2. of the Author of Proteſtancie c. 1. and 3. Out of which it is euident, that ether they are in no Church, becaus there is none beſid the whole, or in a new made Church. Let them shew, that anie Father euer put that particle (*Cauſeles*) in the definition of Schiſme, or ſaied, that there can be iuſt cauſe of ſeparation from the communion of the whole viſible Church: or they muſt confés, that according as the Fathers vſe the word, *Sciſme*, they are guiltie of Sciſme, in ſeparating themſelues from the external communion of the whole viſible Church: and ſo in iudgment of the Fathers (as they vſe the word) are Sciſmatiks. And if they be not Sciſmatiks, as themſelues

Sea alſo ſupra n. 5.

Caluin Ep. 141. diſceſſionẽ a toto mũdo facere eoactis ſumus.

Proteſtants, Schiſmatiks as the Fathers vſe that word.

pleaſe to vſe the word, it little importeth, let them equiuocate as they pleaſe, and vſe words without matter.

7. Let not therfore Chilling worth c. 5. cit. p. 272. adviſe men, *to look that their cauſe of ſeparation from anie Churches communion be iuſt, becaus it is as much as their ſoule is worth*: but let him look, that he make no ſeparation at al from the communion of the whole Church, becaus hereof no cauſe can be iuſt. For (as I ſaied) to goe out of the whole Church, is to be in no Church at al. Herevpon S. Auguſtin l. 2. contra Petil. c. 16. ſaied. *I obiect to thee the ſin of Sciſme, which thou wilt denie, but I wil ſtreigt proue. For thou doeſt not comunicate with al nations*: which proof were none, if there could be iuſt cauſe of not communicating with al Nations: but he should haue added, that cauſeleſly he he did not communicate. And lib. de vnitate c. 4. *whoſoeuer beleue that Ieſus Chriſt came in flesh, in which he ſuffered, was borne, &c. yet ſo diſſent*

S. Auguſtin, puts ſchiſme merely in ſeparation frō the whole.

Schiſme ſimply, not to communicate with the whole Church.

from his Bodie, which is the Church, as their communion is not with the whole, wherſoeuer it is ſpread, but is found ſeparate in ſome part, it is manifeſt, that they are not in the Catholik Church.

Schiſme, not to communicate with the whole.

Which were not manfeſt, if there could be iuſt cauſe of not communicating with the whole. And euident it is, out of what we related before out of Saint Auguſtin: that he meaneth of communion in Sacraments, and publik praier. And therfore vntruely ſaied Doctor Potter ſec. 2. p. 33. *That Proteſtants cõmunicate* (as Saint Auguſtin meant) *with the Catholik Church, in what parte or place of the world ſoeuer.* For they communicate not at al with her in Sacraments and publik praier. And ſo according to Saint Auguſtins doctrin, manifeſtly are out of the Catholik Church. Beſids, Doctor Potter ſpeaketh not conſequently, when ſec. 2 p. 66. he faieth: *we do not communicate with Rome in her publik Liturgie: in that, our communion is diſſolued.* And yet ſec. 3. p. 74. *Her cõmunion we forſake not, no more then the Bodie of Chriſt.* For how doth

c. 3. n. 3. 6. l. 4.

doth he not forsake the communion of Rome, who doth not communicate with her in Liturgie, and whose communion in that, is dissolued: But to returne to Saint Augustin: he epist. 48. affirmeth: *we are certaine, that none can iustly separate himself from the communion of al Nations.* Item: *None can haue iust cause to separate their cõmunion from the communion of al Nations*: lib. 2. contra Parmen. cap. 11. *There is no iust necessitie to break vnitie.* And l. 3. c. 4. *The world doth securely iugde, that they are not good, who separate themselues from the world, in what parte of land soeuer.* And ib. c. 5. *Let vs hold it firme and sure, that no good men can deuide themselues from the Church*: lib. 3. de Baptis. c. 16. *It is charitie, which they haue not, who are cut from the communion of the Catholik Church.* And epist. 152. *whosoeuer is separated from this Catholik Church, albeit he think, he liues lawdably, by this only wickdnes, that he is separated from the vnitie of Christ, he hath not life, but the wrath of God remaineth vpon him.* Lo, to be separated from

None can iustly separate.

No iust cause to forsake the Church.

No good men can separate.

the Catholik Church, is to beſepated from the vnitie of Chriſt. And what iuſt cauſe can there be, to be ſeparated from the vnitie of Chriſt? And epiſt. 48. Relateth, that certaine Donatiſts ſaied: *we thought it made no matter, where we held Chriſts faith.* So that it is an error of Donatiſts, to think, that faith wil ſuffice without communion. Finally S. Cyprian l. de vnitate. *Let none think, that good men can leaue the Church.*

Donatiſts thought faith, would ſuffice without communion.

8. Proteſtants alſo ſometimes confés, that there can be no iuſt cauſe to leaue the communion of the whole Church. For Caluin 4. inſtit. c. 1. §. 10. ſaieth: *Departure from the Church of God, is denial of Chriſt*, which were not true, if there were iuſt cauſe of departure. And lib. de Neceſ. Reform. Eccleſ. p. 68. being vrged, that there is no iuſt cauſe, for which we maie break the vnitie of the Church; he doth not anſwer, that there can be iuſt cauſe hereof: but (as ſuppoſing that) denieth that they are out of the communion of the Church. And

Vſher ſerm to Houſe of Com. No cauſe why We ſhould make a rent in the Church of God.

againe : *But we are put back with this only engin. That no cauſe excuſeth departure from the Church. But we denie, that we do ſo.* Surely, if he had thought, that there could be iuſt cauſe to break the vnitie of the whole Church, or to goe out of her communion, he would here haue ſaied it. But he did not then dreame, that there could be a iuſt or cauſeful ſeparation from the cõmunion of the whole Church, which ſome Proteſtants ſince haue found out. Lord Canterburie p. 139. *There can be no iuſt cauſe, to make à Schiſme from the whole Church.* Item p. 192. D. Potter ſec. 3. p. 74. *There nether was, nor can be, anie iuſt cauſe to depart from the Church of Chriſt, no more then from Chriſt himſelf.* Chillingworth ſect. 5. p. 170. and 272. alloweth thes words of D. Potter, and addeth p. 298. *It is moſt true, that there can be no iuſt cauſe to depart from the Church: That is, to ceaſe being a member of the Church, no more then to depart from Chriſt himſelf.* And ſurely, he ceaſeth being a member of the Church, who ſeparateth himſelf

no iuſt cauſe to goe from the whole Church.

VVho leaueth to be of the whole Church leaueth to be of anie Church

from the communion of the whole viſible Church. Becaus communion (as I haue proued) is an eſſential parte of the viſible Church: And he can be no member of the viſible Church, who wanteth an eſſential parte of it. And to depart from the communion of the viſible Church, is not (as Chillingworth ſpeaketh p. 269. 283. 298. 302.) *te depart frō ſome opiniōs or practiſes of the Church.* But it is to depart from ſome point of faith, or from communicating with the Church, in vſe of Sacraments, Liturgie, and publik worship of God, as is euident, and himſelf confeſſeth ib. p. 265. and we related his words c. 13. nu. 4. In which to communicate, is moſt ſubſtantial to the Church. For Sacraments, Liturgie, and publik worship of God, are a principal external end of the Church. And namely Sacraments are put in the definition of the Church by Proteſtants. Wherfore, to be aſſociated and communicate in them, is moſt ſubſtantial to her, who is a Societie in vſe of them, and in profeſſion

c. 12. nu. 5. l. 2.

of Christs faith. And therfore to depart from her communion in them, is clearely to depart from the societie.

9. And here is to be Noted, that Protestants cannot make distinction of fundamental and Not fundamental communion, as they did of fundamental and Not fundamētal articles. For separating themselues from communion in Sacraments, Liturgie, and publik worship of God, they separated themselues most fundamentally in communion, and condemning the communion in thes, of the Church, frō which they separated, they must condemne the fundamental communion, and so saie, she is substantially no Church. Whervpon it must needs follow, that ether they must make a new Church, substantially different from the whole visible Church, or els be in no Church at al. For (as I haue saied) There can be no Church besids the whole Church: Wheras, deuiding articles into fundamental and Not fundamental, and saying, that the

Protestants make not a distinctiō of fundamētal and not fundamental Cōmunion.

Church, from which they ſeparated themſelues, retained the fundamental articles, which cõſtitute a Church, and that they ſeparated themſelues from her only in Not fundamental points, they had, ſome colour to ſaie, that they ſtil remained in the ſubſtãce of the Church, frõ which they made ſeparation; And therfore an Argumẽt, taken from Proteſtants ſeparation in communion from the whole Church, is more forcible againſt them, then taken from their ſeparation in faith from the whole viſible Church. For her faith they leaft but partly: but her Communion they leaft wholy.

10. Nether helpeth it which Chillingworth: ſaieth: c. 5. p. 274. and 295. *Though the whole Church were corrupted, yet Luther and his Followers forſook not the whole corrupted Church, or the external communion of it, but only forſook that parte which was corrupted, and ſtil would be ſo, but forſook not themſelues, and their owne communion.* For though Luther and his followers forſook not themſelues, yet they forſook their com-

Luther and his fellowes forſook their owne cõmunion, which they had with the whole Church.

munion which they had with the whole Church in her Sacraments, Liturgie, and publik ſeruice, and inſteed of that, began a new communion among themſelues, in an other Liturgie. For they ioined not themſelues in communion to anie Church preexiſtent, in her Liturgie and publik ſeruice: and ſo they forſooke the communion of the whole viſible Church, euen their owne communion, which before they had with her, and therby ceaſed to be anie formal parte of the whole preexiſtēt Church, becaus they wholy leaft her communion in Sacraments and Liturgie, which was eſſential to her: and began a new Church, as they began wholy a new communion, in new vſe of Sacraments, in a new Liturgie, and new publik ſeruice. Howſoeuer therfore, Chillingworth c. 6. p. 334. and D. Potter ſaie ſec. 3. p. 58. *Proteſtants neuer intended to erect a new Church*, ſeing they intended to erect a new cōmunion in Sacraments, and publik worship of God, they intended to erect a new Church. Ne-

And began a new communion.

VVho intēd new communion, intend a new Church.

ther is the example of ſome leauing the diſeaſe of a Societie, and yet not the Societie itſelf, to the purpoſe. For a diſeaſe is an accident to a Societie, but communion in Sacraments is eſſential to a Church, becaus she is a Societie in vſe of Sacraments, Liturgie, and publik ſeruice of Chriſt. And therfore this communion being leaſt, the Societie itſelf is leaſt.

To communicate in Sacraments, is more then to vſe common Sacraments.

11. Perhaps ſome maie ſaie, that Luther and his Followers leaſt not the communion of the whole Church in Sacraments, becaus he retained the ſame Sacraments, which the whole Church had. But beſids, that Luther retained no Sacrament which the whole Church had, beſide baptiſme, and ſo had not Sacraments, but only one Sacrament cõmon with the whole Church: It is one thing, to haue ſome Sacraments common with the whole Church, which Schiſmatiks haue, and an other, to haue communion in Sacraments, which Schiſmatiks haue not, nor Luther had: For he did not participate with the whole Church in

Sacraments. As anie maie eate the ſame meate which an other doth, and yet not dine or ſup with him: So Luther might receaue the ſame Sacraments, which the whole Church did, yet not communicate with the whole Church in Sacraments.

12. By what hath been ſaied, we maie ſee, that thes, and the like errors shew wel, that Proteſtants are of the number of thos, whom the Apoſtle ſaieth, know not what they ſpeak of. For if they knew, what true ſauing faith is, They would neuer ſaie, The eſſence of it conſiſteth only in beleif of ſome principal points; or the vnitie of it, in vnitie only of ſuch points: or if they knew, what a true Church is, they would neuer ſaie, that ſome principal points only, conſtitute the eſſence of it, or that the ſubſtantial vnitie of the Church, conſiſteth onely in vnitie of ſuch points: nor would they compare integritie in faith or in communion, to health, and defect in faith or in communion, to diſeaſes or vice: nor ſaie, that they

Proteſtants errors riſe of ignorance of the definitions.

haue communion with al Catholiks in the world, becaus they haue (as they ſaie) loue or charitie to them al: nor ſaie, that thos can be of the ſame Church, who communicate not in vſe of Sacraments, Liturgie, and publik worship of God. For al theſe errors, and the like, riſe of their not knowing or not marking, what is true ſauing faith, what is a true Chriſtian Church, what is true Chriſtian Communion, as is euident by what hath been ſaied and proued: If they would cõſtantly agree with vs, in the definitions of ſauing faith, true Church, and her communion, giuen by the Scripture, Fathers, and by themſelues ſometimes, and confirmed by reaſon, thes errors of theirs, about fundamental and Not fundamẽtal points, about the eſſence, and vnitie of true ſauing faith, and about the true Chriſtian Church, and her communion, would preſently vanish. And if they wil mainteine thes errors, they muſt needs reiect the definitions of true ſauing faith, true Church, and her commu-

nion, giuen by Scripture, Fathers, and themſelues ſometimes, and giue new definitions, and confés, that they diſpute not with vs of ſuch a faith, Church, or communion, as Scripture, Fathers, and themſelues ſometimes, propoſe: but of an other faith, Church, and communion, of which nether Scripture, nor Fathers euer dreamed, deſcribed, or propoſed to vs; but is inuented by themſelues. And if they wil confés this, I wil not diſpute with them, whether there be anie fundamental or Not fundamental articles to ſuch a faith, or Church, or whether inward charitie wil ſuffice to ſuch a communion, as they haue deuiſed, different from the faith, Church, and communion deſcribed by Scripture, and Fathers, and themſelues ſometimes. This I am ſure, That no other faith, Church, or communion, wil help them to ſaluation, but ſuch a faith, Church, and communion, as Scripture, and Fathers propoſe. And ſuch faith, and Church, I haue clearly shewed, cannot admit

Proteſtants muſt make new definitions and ſo change the queſtion.

anie Not fundamental points in the Proteſtants ſenſe, nor anie ſinful diuiſion in points of faith, or in communion of Sacraments, Liturgie, or publik worship of God. But ſuch faith, ſuch Church, ſuch communion, is perfectly and entirely one (at leaſt virtually and implicitly) in al points of faith, in al vſe of Sacraments, and al publik worship of God: and can only differ in ſome rites or ceremonies; which being accidental, and therfore by none put into the definition of the Church, (as profeſſion of faith and communion) cannot deuide ſubſtance of the Church. And ſuch a Church, none is, but the Roman Catholik Church. And who careful of his ſaluation, wil not prefer a Church, which is entirely one in al points of faith, and communion, before a Church, which confeſſedly is deuided both in ſome points of faith, and altogether in communion? If one ask, why can not the Church admit diuiſion in faith or communion, as wel as in other matters: I anſwer,

becaus Faith and Communion are eſſential partes of the Church, and, as ſuch, put in her definition: and nothing can admit diuiſion in its eſſential partes. For diuiſion of a thing in eſſential parts, is deſtruction of it. In other matters, which are not eſſential to her, she may be deuided, and not deſtroied.

The aforeſaied doctrin of Catholikes and Proteſtants, and their Defenders, compared together.

FOVRTEENTH CHAPTER.

1. HItherto (Gentle Reader) haue we refuted the diſtinction of fundamental and Not fundamental points in the Proteſtants ſenſe, and clearely shewed, that in their ſenſe, it introduceth formal hereſie, deſtroieth true ſauing faith, Catholik Church, and ſaluation, conteineth Infidelitie,

How fals the Proteſtants diſtinction is.

and denieth Gods veracitie, and ſo is the verie ground of Atheiſme. We haue alſo shewed, that this diſtinctiō, euen in the Proteſtants ſenſe, ſufficeth them not, for that purpoſe for which they deuiſed it: which was, to mainteine ſome ſuch Churches, as are ſinfully deuided in points of faith: becaus ſome of them are deuided euen in fundamental points, and al are wholy deuided in communion of Sacraments and publik worship of God: which diuiſion, as wel deſtroieth the Church, as diuiſion in fundamental points, doth.

How vnſufficient for their purpoſe.

Rouſe of Cath. Charitie c. 9.

2. Now it reſteth, out of that which hath been ſaied, to compare the faith and Church of Catholiks, and of Proteſtants together: and alſo the certaintie, or vncertaintie of their defenders, that thou maiſt the better iudge, whether of thes ſeueral faithes, or Churches, is of God, and which of their Defenders defend their doctrin for truth, or conſcience ſake, whether, to make a ſhift for a Time.

3. The Catholiks faith, eſſentially embraceth al Gods reuealed word ſufficiently propoſed: The * Proteſtants faith, eſſentially embraceth only the fundamental points. The Catholiks faith, can ſtand with no hereſie, or ſinful denial of anie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed: Proteſtants faith, can ſtand with anie hereſie, or ſinful denial of anie point of faith, which is not fundamental, how ſufficiently ſoeuer it be propoſed, which is (as Proteſtants ſometimes confés) infidelitie, and a giuing the Lie to God. Catholikes faith, is perfectly and entirely one, and the ſame in euerie one, beleuing actually euerie parte of Gods word ſufficiently propoſed, and virtually, euerie parte whatſoeuer: Proteſtants faith, is neceſſarily one, only in fundamental points, and maie be various or deuided in al other points, how ſufficiently ſoeuer they be propoſed, which vnitie, is merely in parte, and is true multiplicitie. Catholik faith, is approued of Proteſtants, to conteine

Difference betweene their faithes

* c. 5. n. 2.

1.

2. c. 2. n. 2. l. 1.

c. 3. n. 5. 6. l. 2.

3. c. 5 n. 2. l. 2.

4. c. 5. n. 7. l. 1.

C.5.n. 7. al that is eſſential to true faith: Proteſtants faith, is proued of Catholiks, to want manie things eſſential to true faith.

Differẽce betweene their Churches.

1. 4. Likewiſe the Catholik Church, embraceth onlỹ thos, who actually beleiue euerie point of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them, and virtually what other points of faith ſoeuer. Proteſtants Church, embra-

C.6.n.8.l.2. ceth ſometimes al that are Chriſtians, or al, that profés Chriſts name, what heretiks ſoeuer they be: Sometimes, al that beleiue the fundamẽtal points, howſoeuer they ſinfully denie other points ſufficiently propoſed: which

C.3.n.5.6. l.2. is to include Infidels, and Giuers of the Lie to God. The Catholik Church,

2. is perfectly and entirely one, both in profeſſion of faith, and in communion of Sacraments, and publik worſhip of God: Proteſtants Church is at

C.5.n.2.l.2. moſt, one in profeſſion of fundamental points, and various in al other points: And no waie one (but wholy deuided) in communion of Sacraments, and publik worship of God.

Which

Which is to be one in a ſmal parte, and to be ſimply and truly manie. The Catholik Church, is approued of Proteſtants, to be a true [a] Church, a member of the Catholik Church, A member of the Bodie of Chriſt. Her Religion, a poſſible waie of ſaluation, a ſafe [b] waie for them that beleue as they profés, and ſafeſt for the ignorants: and euen thos, who are moſt obſtinat in her, members of the Catholik Church. The Proteſtāts Church is condemned of al Catholiks, for a falſe Church, guiltie both of hereſie, and ſchiſme, and to haue no poſſible waie of ſaluation, but aſſured waie of damnation to al that wittingly liue and die in her.

3.

a C.2.nu.3. c.7.nu.9.

4.

b c.7.n.3.7. c.2.n.3.

5. Seing therfore, by the teſtimonie of holie Scripture, Fathers, and Reaſon, and Confeſſion of Proteſtants, the faith, and Church of God, is both one and holie, iudge, whether of thes two faiths, or Churches, be more one, or more holie; whether that faith be not more one, which admitteth no voluntarie diuiſion in anie

Cath. faith more one, then Proteſtants.

point of faith whatſoeuer, then that, which admitteth voluntarie diuiſion in al points of faith; beſids thos, which are fundamental. And whether that faith be not more holie, which admitteth no ſinful denial of Gods word whatſoeuer, then that, which admitteth ſinful denial of al his word, beſids that which is fundamental how ſufficiently ſoeuer it be propoſed: which kinde of denial, is * Infidelitie, and a giuing of the lie to God. And whether that faith, be not more ſecure, which is approued of its Aduerſaries to conteine al that is * eſſential to true faith, then that, which is proued of Catholiks, to want manie things eſſential to true faith.

And more holie.

* *C.3. nu.5. l.2.*

And more ſecure.

* *c.5.n.5.l 1.*

6. Likewiſe, whether that Church be not more one, which is entirely one, both in profeſſion of al points of faith, and in communion of Sacraments: then that, which requireth no more vnitie, but in fundamental points which euerie one is actually to beleue, and admitteth ſinful diuiſion in al other points, and whole diuiſion

Catholik Church more one then Proteſtants.

in communion of Sacraments, and publik worship of God. And whether that be not more holie, which admitteth no hereſie in points of faith, nor no ſchiſme in diuiſion of communion, then that which admitts al hereſies, except in fundamental points, and al ſchime in diuiſion of communion. And whether that Church be not the ſafer waie to ſaluation, which is approued of its Aduerſaries for * ſafe, then that which is approued only of its followers, and vtterly condemned by al aduerſaries.

And more holie.

And more ſafe.

* c. 7. n. 3. 6. 2 n. 3. l. 2.

7. And as for the Defenders of thes different faiths and Churches, it is euident, that Catholiks conſtantly and reſolutly condemne the diſtinction of fundamental and Not fundamental articles in the Proteſtants ſenſe, and auouch, that there are no certaine points ſo ſufficient to ſauing faith, to a Church, or to ſaluation, that others maie be denied, or not beleued, though they be ſufficiently propoſed. None ſo Not fundamental, as they muſt not neceſſarily

Catholiks conſtant in their doctrin.

1

be beleued of a Church, and for ſal-
uation, if they be ſufficiently propo-
2. ſed: That there be more points of
faith, then thos, which muſt be actual-
3. ly beleued of euerie one: That it is
true hereſie, to denie anie point of
4. faith ſufficiently propoſed: That ſinful
denial of anie ſuch point of faith, de-
ſtroieth true ſauing faith, and ſalua-
tion, the ſubſtance, and vnitie of the
5. true Church: That communion in
Sacraments and publik worship of
God, is eſſential to a true Church:
6. That though there were ſuch diſtin-
ction in points of faith, as Proteſtants
make, yet that would not ſaue ſome of
their Churches, which err euen in
fundamental articles, and want al
communion in Sacraments, and in
publik worship of God; and that ſeing
7. the Proteſtants faith doth not eſſen-
tially embrace al Gods reuealed word
ſufficiently propoſed, but only ſome
parte of it, nor is oppoſit to hereſie in
al points, nor is one in al Gods word,
8. but onely in ſome part, that it is not
true ſauing faith. And ſeing their

Church doth not profés Gods entire word, nor is one at moſt, more then in fundamental points, nor is at al one in communion of Sacraments and publik worship of God, it cannot be the true Church of God: And ſeing it did leaue the communion of the whole viſible Church, and therby leaft the whole viſible Church, and leauing the whole, leaft al viſible Churches, and leauing al, that it can be in no viſible Church, vnles at their ſeparation there were ſome new viſible Church made. Theſe points (I ſaie) Catholiks conſtantly teach. .9

8. Wheras Proteſtants, moſt vnconſtantly teach almoſt al that we haue rehearſed of their doctrin. For ſometimes they teach, that their Not fundamental points [a] are points of faith: Sometimes they [b] are not. Sometimes ſinful denial of them is [c] hereſie: Sometimes it is [d] not. Sometimes ſinful denial of them, is a ſufficient [e] cauſe of ſeparation Sometimes it is [f] not. Sometimes Proteſtants can giue a Catalogue [g] of fundamen-

a C. 1. n. 5. 6 7.
b C. 5. n. 8.
c C. 2. n. 4. l. 1.
d C. 2. n 5.
e c. 6. n. 8.
f c. 2. n. 3. c. 5. n. 5.
g c. 6. n. 2.

tals: Sometime they cannot. [h] Sometimes the Roman Church, is a [i] true Church in eſſence: Sometimes she is [k] not. Sometimes her errors are [l] fundamental: Sometimes they are [m] not. Sometimes [n] heretiks are in the Church. Sometimes they are [o] not. Sometimes heretiks [p] maie be ſaued: Sometimes they [q] cannot. Sometimes a true Church [r] can err in fundamentals: Sometimes it [s] cannot. Sometimes al [t] points of faith are neceſſarie to ſauing faith: Sometimes they are [u] not. Sometimes denial of anie point ſufficiently propoſed, [x] deſtroieth true faith: Sometimes it doth [y] not. Sometimes ſinful denial of anie point of faith [z] deſtroieth the ſubſtance of the Church. Sometimes it doth [a] not. Sometimes diuiſion in anie point of faith [b] deſtroieth the vnitie of the Church: Sometimes it doth [c] not. Sometimes there is [d] iuſt cauſe of ſeparation from the whole viſible Church: Sometimes there is [e] not. Sometimes cõmunion in Sacraments and publik worship of

h c.6 n.3.4.
i c 2.n.6 c. 7.n.3 4.
k c 6 n.5.c. 5 n.7.
l c.5 n.7.c. 6.n 5.
m c 5.n.7.
n c. 2.n. 5.
o c.7.n.12. 13.l.2.
p c 6.n.4.5.
q c 1.n.12. c.10.n.4 5.
r c.7.n.2. 3.4.
s c 7.nu, 5. 6.7.
t c3 n 5.6. 7.l.2.
u c.2.n.2
x c.4.n.6.7. l.2.
y c.2.n.3.
z c.6 n.4.5. l.2.
a c.3.nu.2. l.2.
b c.7.n 10. l.2.
c c.5.nu.2. l.2.
d c.13.n.4. l.2.
e c.12.nu.8. l.2.

God is [f] essential to the Church: Sometimes it is & not. Sometimes to leaue the communion of the Church, is to [h] leaue the Church: Sometimes it is [i] not. Sometimes wilful error in faith [k] is iust cause to forsake a Church: Sometimes it is [l] not.

f c. 12. n. 5. l. 2.
g c. 11. n. 1. l. 2.
h c 12. n. 5. l 2.
i c. 12 n. 4. 5. l 2.
k c 11. n. 5. l 2.
l c 9 nn. 6. c. 2. n. 3.

9. Surely, it must be a verie il cause, that driueth such wittie and Learned men thus often, and thus plainely to contradict themselues, about one question of their fundamental and Not fundamental points. For it is nether want of wit, nor of learning, that maketh them in this sort to contradict themselues: but whiles they wil ioine truth with falshood, faith with heresie, Gods Church with a false Church, they cannot doe otherwise. For the euidence of truth, of faith, and of Gods Church, forceth them to saie one thing, and falshood, heresie, and their false Church maketh them to saie the quite contrarie. Wherfore we must no more expect of heretiks to speake agreably to themselues, then of Drunken men to goe

ſtreight. For heretiks be (as the Prophet ſpeaketh) *drunk, and not with wine*: hereſie, is a ſpiritual drunkenes, which maketh men to reele betweene truth and falshood, as drunkenes maketh men reele from one ſide to an other. It maie be, that Catholik writers in ſome greate work, and writing vpon different matters, maie contradict themſelues by forgetfulnes: but that wittie and learned men, in ſo ſmal works, and in one kinde of matter, should ſo often, and ſo plainely contradict themſelues, cannot proceed, but of the nature of the matter, which they would mainteine, and of their ſpiritual drunkenes, or that ſpirit of giddines, which (as the aforeſaied Prophet ſaieth) *our Lord hath mingled in the midſt of Egipt, and made Egipt to err in al her worke, as a drunken and vomiting man erreth.*

Eſaie 51.

Caluin. Cōfutat. Hollandi. Spiritus vertiginis quo minatur Deus ſe verbi ſui cōtemptores potaturum, brutam omnium ebrioſorū amentiam ſuperat.

Athan. orat. 2. cōt. Arian Qui incidūt in hereſim mentis vertigine laborant. C. 19.

10. And finally, out of al hitherto ſaied, I conclude, that it is not againſt charitie, but rather moſt agreable to Chriſtian faith and true charitie, to admonish al Churches or perſons,

Charitie, to tel Churches ſinfully erring, of their damnable ſtate.

that they are in a damnable ſtate, who err ſinfully ether becaus they wil not beleue ſome point of Chriſtian faith, or part of Gods word, ſufficiently propoſed to them, or through their fault, haue it not ſufficiently propoſed: For (as Proteſtants confeſſed cap. 10.) *The difference is not great, betweene him, that is wilfully blinde, and him, that knowingly gainſaieth the truth: and who, were it not for their owne auoidable fault, might and ſhould ſee truth, and do not, their error is damnable: And if anie be negligent in ſeeking truth, vnwilling to finde it, or might ſee it, and wil not, his caſe, without repentance, is deſperate;* Wherfore thus I argue in forme.

Sinful ignorant of ſufficient propoſing, excuſeth not.

11. It is charitie to admonish them, that they are in a damnable ſtate, who err damnably, committ an act of Infidelitie, and giue God the Lie: But al that err againſt points of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them, do ſo; and the like caſe is of al, who for their fault haue not ſuch points ſufficiently propoſed to them. Therfore it is charitie, to admonish al who err againſt

Becaus they err damnably. *See Chilling. c. 6. p. 359.*

Al ſinful errãts in faith are damnable.

points of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them, or who (for their fault) haue them not ſufficiently propoſed to thē, that they are in damnable ſtate. The Maior is euident, and the Minor proued, and confeſſed alſo by Proteſtants, c. 10.

Becaus they are true heretiks.

12. Secondly, it is true charitie, to admonish al formal heretiks, that they are in ſtate of damnation: But al that beleue not ſome points of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them, or for their fault haue them not ſufficiently propoſed, are formal heretiks. Therfore it is charitie to tel al ſuch, that they are in ſtate of damnation. The Maior is proued c. 9. and the Minor c. 10.

Becaus they deſtroie faith

13. Thirdly, it is true charitie, to tel al, that deſtroie true ſauing faith, and the vnitie therof, that they are in ſtate of damnation: But al that beleue not ſome points of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them, or, through their fault, haue not them ſo propoſed to them, doe ſo. Therfore it is true charitie to tel them, that they are in ſtate of damnation. The Maior is euident,

for without faith, it is impoſſible to pleaſe God. And the Minor is proued cap. 11.

14. Fourthly, it is true charitie to tel al ſuch, as deſtroie the nature or ſubſtance of Chriſts true Church, that they are in damnable ſtate: but al ſuch as beleue not ſome points of faith ſufficiētly propoſed to them, or through their fault, haue them not ſufficiently propoſed, doe ſo. Therfore, &c. The Maior is euident; and the Minor is proued c. 13. *Becaus they deſtroie the Church.*

15. Fiftly, it is true charitie, to tel al ſuch as deſtroie the vnitie of Chriſts Church, that they are in ſtate of damnation: But al ſuch as beleue not ſome points of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them, or through their fault haue them not ſufficiently propoſed, doe ſo. Therfore it is true charitie to tel al ſuch, that they are in ſtate of damnation. The Maior is euident: And the Minor is proued c. 14. *Becaus they deſtroie the vnitie of the Church. See L. Lauda ſec. 35 p. 284*

16. Sixtly, it is true charitie to tel al ſuch, as by deeds profés a fals Church, to be a true Church, that they are in *Becaus they profés a falſe Church.*

damnable ſtate: But al that communicate in Sacraments, or Liturgie, with a fals Church, doe ſo. Therfore it is true charitie to tel them, that they are in a damnable ſtate. The Maior, and Minor are proued c. 15.

Becaus they put thẽſelues out of al Churches.

17. Seauenthly, it is true charitie, to tel ſuch as put thẽſelues out of euerie true Church, That they are in a damnable ſtate: But al ſuch, as ether put themſelues out of the communion in Sacraments, and Liturgie, of the whole Church, (as did Luther and his firſt followers) or doe themſelues liue out of that communion (as thos doe that yet follow him) doe ſo. Therfore it is charitie, to tel al ſuch, that they are in a damnable ſtate. The Maior is euident: and the Minor proued c. 18. and 19.

Abhominable that ſinful error in faith is not damnable.

18. Eightly, becaus the contrarie doctrin, to wit, that it is not charitie, to warne a man, that is in ſtare of damnation (as al are, that ſinfully erra gainſt anie point of faith or communion) is ſo abhominable, as no Chriſtian (I think) wil dare to auouch it in

plaine and expres termes.

19. And that Proteſtant Churches ſinfully err againſt points of faith ſufficiently propoſed, or, through their fault, haue not them ſufficiently propoſed, is likewiſe manifeſt. For that al Proteſtants Churches err in points of faith, is confeſſed by Proteſtants themſelues cap. 2. And that thos points are ſufficiently propoſed to them, or that it is their fault, that they are not ſo propoſed, is likewiſe euident. Beſids the Proteſtants Church went out of the whole Churches Communion in Sacraments and Liturgie, and began a new Communion of their owne. And ſo is in no Church, or is a new Church c. 19.

Proteſtants Churches ſinfully err in points of faith.

And in Cõmunion.

20. Innumerable more, and moſt euident proofes, might be brought, that Proteſtants Churches ſinfully err againſt points of faith ſufficiently propoſed to them, or which (if it were not their fault) would be ſo propoſed to them: But I wil not goe out of the compas of what hath been ſaied in this Treatiſe. Who wil ſee at large the

errors of Proteſtants ſufficiently diſproued, euen by the expres word of God, maie read the Collation of the Catholik and Proteſtant doctrin, by the expres word of God. Which hath beene twentie yeares agoe published, and not yet anſwered by anie Proteſtant. Which is an euident argument that they can not anſwer it with anie probabilitie, ſeing they haue no pretenſe but the word of God.

FINIS.

6 NO 63

Errata.

Pag. 43. lin. 10. *with ſauing.* dele *ſauing.*
P. 95. lin. *wherof.* lege *wherfore.* P. 115.
lin. 20. *the* lege *to.* P. 138. lin. 8. *faict.*
lege *faith.* P. 159. lin. 16. *be to.* lege
to be. P. 210. marg. *what* lege *why.*
P. 252. lin. 26. after *not.* add. *beleue not.*
P. 261. lin. 14. dele *and.*